



Anno 1778.

PHILLIPS ACADEMY



OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES

LIBRARY











HARVARD STUDIES  
IN  
CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

*EDITED BY A COMMITTEE OF THE CLASSICAL  
INSTRUCTORS IN HARVARD UNIVERSITY*

VOLUME LV



CAMBRIDGE  
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD  
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1944

COPYRIGHT, 1944  
BY THE PRESIDENT AND FELLOWS OF HARVARD COLLEGE

60090

.480  
H26  
v.55

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA



## PREFATORY NOTE

THESE Studies are published by authority of Harvard University and are contributed chiefly by its instructors and graduates, although contributions from other sources are not excluded. The publication is partly supported by a fund of about \$15,000, generously subscribed by the Class of 1856.

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE	}	EDITORIAL COMMITTEE
JOSHUA WHATMOUGH		
HERBERT BLOCH		



## CONTENTS

KEATIKA .....	1
Joshua Whatmough	
PRINCIPLES OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM KNOWN TO ST. JEROME .....	87
Karl Kelchner Hulley	
SUMMARIES OF DISSERTATIONS FOR THE DEGREE OF PH.D. ....	111
INDEX .....	119



KEΛTIKA  
BEING PROLEGOMENA TO  
A STUDY OF  
THE DIALECTS OF ANCIENT GAUL<sup>1</sup>

BY JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

i. *Prefatory*, 1; ii. *Introductory*, 9; iii. *Gaul before the Romans*, 34; iv. *The Romanization of Gaul*, 52; v. *The End of Keltic in Gaul*, 68; Note A. *On the name "Ligurian,"* 77; Note B. *On Venetic ecupetaris*, 80; Note C. *On Polybius II* 35.4, 82.

I. PREFATORY

EVEN the late Sir John Rhys, although he was not a competent critic of such matters, came in time to understand that the pre-Latin dialects of Gaul and of northern Italy present related problems of classification, at least in Provence and the western part of Gallia Cisalpina: merely related, that is, not identical. Whoever tries to make up his mind about the one, must, sooner or later, make up his mind about the other. It was for this reason that at one time I intended to give some account of the inscriptions called "Celtic" by Rhys, "Ligurian" by d'Arbois de Jubainville, in the Appendix (A. Alien Inscriptions) of *The Prae-Italic Dialects of Italy* (Vol. II, 1933, see p. 612, no. 4). That plan proved impracticable. Hence I decided to expand what had begun simply as an account of the pre-Roman dialect of Provence into a survey of the linguistic remains, more or less contemporary, of Gaul as a whole — in the broadest interpretation of that variously defined geographical label.

<sup>1</sup> To be published, it is hoped, in the near future. There is no "medieval" or "modern" Gaul; but my concern is with geographical more than with chronological divisions, and "pre-Roman," "Roman," "Christian" would all be too trenchant for my purpose; "ancient" is intended to include them all, to the end of the Empire.

The decision was stimulated partly by the need, felt also by others,<sup>2</sup> of a critical edition of the pre-Latin inscriptions of Gaul (other than Greek or Phoenician); but even more by the statements, made by ancient writers, that differences in dialect (γλώττη or *lingua*) existed between Aquitania and Gallia Lugdunensis and between Lugdunensis and Gallia Belgica; and by the desire which I felt either to substantiate, if I could, by as full a collection of evidence as possible, or else to disprove, those statements. For in the past it has been the inconclusive practice sometimes to dismiss the matter with an assertion that the differences are "not clear" to us, sometimes to accept the ancient authors at their face value, without making an attempt to assemble much, if any, of the extremely fragmentary yet abundant testimony that is now available, but, as a rule, not without conjecturing what the differences might have been. This dissipated evidence, which it was necessary to bring together into one place if its meaning was to be extracted from it, I have collected; and the conclusions that I shall offer are based upon its collection. With the three Gauls I have included the *prouincia* Narbonensis and the two Germanies, thereby affording as complete an account as possible of the dialects of ancient Gaul entire. Hence it is permitted to explain the differences that existed among them, and to do so by means of an ordered and unified documentation, instead of mere generalization resting on nothing more than vague memories of the scattered evidence or conjectures about its probable nature.

Inevitably evidence other than direct non-Latin epigraphic testimony had to be admitted. But I have neither repeated the task begun, if not quite completed, by Holder, of collecting the glosses and ancient proper names of Gaul, and all the ancient references to them — in fact every scrap of ancient writing that bears, however remotely, upon Gaul; nor copied his collections except by way of relevant citation. For the *testimonia*, not as a rule quoted by me, recourse must still be had to Holder's *Altceltischer Sprachschatz*. What I have done, in using Holder's work, has been to put into their proper geographical location, whenever that was possible, selected pertinent items — that is, items which give some clue to the local pre-Latin dialect — taken

<sup>2</sup> E.g., by Jacobsthal, see *Arch. Anz.* XLV 1930, 235-236.

from the medley which in Holder has no arrangement at all other than the conventional, and therefore readily consulted, but not illuminating, merely alphabetical order. (The few relevant items that have come to light since Holder was at work I have of course gathered in.) The selection of all this matter, however, has been made most rigorous, especially in those areas in which we can avail ourselves of at least two dialect inscriptions; elsewhere more liberal, for, without such inscriptions, glosses and nomenclature are now the only available evidence.

The testimony upon which any opinion about the classification of the dialects of ancient Gaul must rest is drawn, therefore, from material that is intractable chiefly because it is fragmentary. But some conclusions emerge which, while not startling, are both positive and clear; and which, while they confirm (or are confirmed by) ancient tradition about the linguistic situation in Roman Gaul, are drawn primarily from extant documents, not from such tradition.

(1) It is certain, then, that a Keltic dialect of the Brythonic group was spoken in pre-Roman, and, for some centuries longer, in Roman Gaul. (2) It is probable that there was at least one enclave there in which a Keltic dialect of the Goidelic group was spoken. (3) It is certain that Iberian was, or had been, spoken in Aquitania and in parts of Narbonensis. (4) It is certain that a Western Germanic dialect was spoken in Belgica in regions adjoining the river Rhine (the later *Germania inferior*) from which it tended to spread westward; and less extensively in *Germania superior*, where Keltic was spoken on both sides of the river but was less subjected to Germanic influence or mastery than in *Germania inferior* or in Belgica. (5) It is presumable that other dialectal differences within Keltic itself had arisen in the course of time in the several parts of Gaul, of the kinds that normally occur when communication between speakers of the same or of a related language is long interrupted or completely severed. (6) It is probable that Ligurian was or had been spoken in Narbonensis. (7) It is probable that the inscriptions commonly called "Gaulish" actually are, with few exceptions, in Keltic. (8) It is, however, certain that Greek and Latin influences are manifest in word-order, and possibly also in a few instances of (a) sound-substitution and (b) word-forms. (9) Lexicographical differences, so far as they can be traced, are, as



would be expected, most clearly marked; less clearly, differences in the development of speech-sounds; differences of accident and syntax, if they existed, as is probable enough, escape us well-nigh entirely.

These conclusions are an adequate answer to the question what the ancients meant by their statements about differences of language in Roman or pre-Roman Gaul. It has been disappointing to spend many hours, in total far out of proportion to the results obtained, going through the vast amount of printed material that indiscriminating editors and publishers year after year thrust upon scholars, on the chance (I will not say in the hope) that some item of real importance might have come to light since the industrious Holder laboriously compiled his thesaurus. But the very paucity of the scant and meagre scraps of new evidence that remained to be gleaned in this way, despite the prodigious activity of the archaeologists, professional and amateur, in France and in the Rhineland, is itself a sufficient indication that the conclusions set forth above are not likely to be overturned, or the general statement of them that I have given to become much more precise, by way of addition or even illustration, in detail.

I do not refer, save most exceptionally, to sources of information which I have not myself seen, nor to items which proved inaccessible in first-hand sources of information. Most of the texts of the dialect inscriptions I had copied in 1929 or later years, and some I had expected to see again in 1939 and 1940. The outbreak of war in Europe prevented that; it has also made unobtainable some new books, and recent issues of periodicals. But although I have examined for myself all that I cite or quote, I do not cite or quote a great deal that I have seen. I have read everything pertinent that I could find. Much of it was not worth reading, much less worth mentioning, either intrinsically or for my immediate purpose. But if critics conclude that because some bibliographical item is not mentioned, therefore I am unaware of its existence, they are more likely to be wrong than right; if a thing is not mentioned, it is probably because I have read it, but do not quote or cite it because I found it unacceptable or actually worthless.

These prolegomena were written as part of *The Dialects of Ancient Gaul*. They are given separately now in order to unburden, in difficult days, a difficult manuscript of matter which is separable and perhaps not indispensable, but which it may be assumed the reader will wish



to have made easily available if presented all together as an introduction to the main work. It is a pleasure, as well as a duty, to acknowledge generous help in their preparation through a grant from the Milton Fund of Harvard University.

### CHIEF WORKS OF REFERENCE

- CA *Carte archéologique de la Gaule romaine* (dressée sous la direction de Adrien Blanchet). Institut de France, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, viz. *Forma Orbis Romani* (Union Académique Internationale). Paris, 1931- .
- Fasc. i: Partie orientale (carte) et texte complet du département des Alpes Maritimes, par Paul Couissin; Partie orientale (carte) du département des Basses-Alpes, par Henry de Gérin-Ricard, 1931.
- Fasc. ii: Carte (partie orientale) et texte complet du département du Var . . . par P. Couissin . . . A. Donnadiou . . . Paul Goby . . . A. Blanchet . . . H. de Gérin-Ricard, 1932.
- Fasc. iii: Carte et texte du département de la Corse . . . par Ambroise Ambrosi, 1933.
- Fasc. iv: Carte de la partie occidentale du département du Var et de la partie orientale du département des Bouches-du-Rhône . . . P. Couissin, H. de Gérin-Ricard, Fernand Benoît (sic), 1934 [*no text*].
- Fasc. v: Carte (partie occidentale) et texte complet du département des Bouches-du-Rhône, par F. Benoît, 1936.
- Fasc. vi: Carte et texte complet du département des Basses-Alpes . . . par H. de Gérin-Ricard . . . A. Blanchet, 1937.
- Fasc. vii: Carte et texte complet du département de Vaucluse, par Joseph Sautel, 1939.
- K. Henrici Kiepert *Formae Orbis Antiqui* (Berlin, 1894-1914), viz. maps no. xxiv (1913) *Galliae partes quae erant Caesaris tempore* with *Civitates trium Galliarum et provinciae tempore Augusti* and *Germania altero p. Chr. n. saeculo*; xxv (1912), *Gallia secundo et tertio p. Chr. n. saeculo*; xxiii (1902) *Italia superior cum regionibus Alpinis*.
- Compare the maps in *CIL* III, V, XII. But observe the strictures of C. Jullian in *REA*, XVI, 1914, 63-70.
- Bibl. Robert de Lasteyrie, Eugène Lefèvre-Pontalis, Alexandre Vidier, *Bibliographie générale des Travaux historiques et archéologiques publiés par les Sociétés savantes de la France*, Paris, I-VI, 1888-1918, I-III, 1906-1914.

Useful in tracing the place of publication of many papers (within these years) which later writers (*more suo*) are apt to cite with inadequate bibliographical detail.

- Mont.* Raoul Montandon, *Bibliographie générale des travaux paléthnologiques et archéologiques* (Époques préhistorique, proto-historique et gallo-romaine), I–VI, 1917–1938, and Suppléments I–III, 1921–1929, France; and (separately, 1917) Canton de Genève et régions voisines; Paris, Geneva, Lyons.
- IJ* *Indogermanisches Jahrbuch* (since 1914), Strassburg, Berlin, and Leipzig.
- AcS* Alfred Holder, *Aliceltischer Sprachschatz*, Leipzig, 1891–1913. Cf. Johann Sofer, “Das keltische Wortgut in den klassischen Sprachen” in *Commentationes Vindobonenses*, II, 1936, 70–92.  
Cf. the criticisms of Ludwig Christian Stern in *Kritischer Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der romanischen Philologie . . . herausgegeben von Karl Vollmöller*, IV, 1898–1900, i, 48, with the reviews cited there; to which add Dottin in *Revue critique d'histoire et de littérature*, nouvelle série, LXXVII 1914, 147–148, and W. Meyer-Lübke in *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, XXXV, 1915, 1509–1511.
- VKG* Holger Pedersen, *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen*, 2 volumes, Göttingen, 1909–1913.  
There is an abridgement in English (by Henry Lewis), *A Concise Comparative Celtic Grammar*, Göttingen, 1937, containing later views on a few matters.
- Do.* Georges Dottin, *La langue gauloise*, Paris, 1920.  
Cf. the reviews by Vendryes in *Revue celtique*, XXXVIII, 1920–21, 179–185; by Loth in *Revue archéologique*, 5e série, XIII, 1921, avril-juin, 108–119 (cf. *RC* XXXIX, 1922, 387–388); by Jud in *Archivum Romanicum* VI, 1922, 188–211; and by Terracini in *Rivista di filologia e d'istruzione classica*, XLIX, 1921, 401–430.
- Rh.* John Rhys, “The Celtic Inscriptions of France and Italy,” *Proceedings of the British Academy*, II, 1905–06, 273–373; [Sir John Rhys] additions and corrections, V, 1911–12, 261–360.  
Cf. the criticisms by d'Arbois de Jubainville in *Revue celtique*, XXVIII, 1907, 209; and by Thurneysen in *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, VI, 1908, 557–558.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> See also the criticisms passed upon another paper of Rhys (“Celtic Inscriptions of Cisalpine Gaul,” *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, VI 1913–14, 23–112) by Loth in *RC* XXXV

- SprFK* Leo Weisgerber, "Die Sprache der Festlandkelten," *Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Römisch-germanische Kommission*, XXter Bericht, 1930, Frankfurt-am-Main, 1931, 147-226.  
Cf. the reviews by G. B[onfante] in *Emerita*, III, Madrid, 1935, 184-185; J. Vendryes in *RC*, LII, 1934, 120-22.
- KR* Rudolf Thurneysen, *Keltoromanisches*, Halle, 1885.
- MHC* W. Dinan [Liam Ó Doighnéain], *Monumenta Historica Celtica*, I, London, 1911.
- FHRC* Johannes Zwicker, "Fontes Historiae Religionis Celticae," in *Fontes historiae religionum ex auctoribus graecis et latinis collectos* edidit Carolus Clemen, Fasc. V i, Berlin, 1934, ii-iii, Bonn, 1935-36.  
Cf. the review by R. Th[urneysen] in *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, XX, 1936, 524.
- RL* Max Ebert, *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*, Berlin, 1924-1932.
- CIL* *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* XII (Gallia Narbonensis), 1888, supplemented by E. Espérandieu, *Inscriptions latines de Gaule* (Narbonnaise), Paris, 1929.
- ILG* XIII (Tres Galliae et duae Germaniae), since 1899, supplemented in part by H. Finke, "Neue Inschriften" (Belgica, Germania superior et inferior) in XVIIter Bericht, 1927, of *Röm.-Germ. Kommission, Deutsches Archäologisches Institut*, Frankfurt-am-Main, 1929, 1\*-107 (Register, 215-233); and by Herbert Nesselhauf, "Neue Inschriften aus dem römischen Germanien und den angrenzenden Gebieten," XXVIIter Bericht, 1937, *R.-G. Komm.*, 1939, 51-134.
- AE* Where these fail, recourse must be had to *L'année épigraphique* (published in *Rev. arch.*), or to the *Rassegna di epigrafia Romana* of Aldo Neppi Modona (i-viii in *Historia* IV-IX 1930-35, ix in *Aevum* XI 1937), and to the "Chronique gallo-romaine" (published in *Revue des études anciennes*).
- TopF* Auguste Vincent, *Toponymie de la France*, Brussels, 1937.
- NLB* *Les noms de lieux de la Belgique*, Brussels, 1927.

1914, 370-375, and by Dottin in *Rev. crit. d'hist. et de litt.*, nouv. sér., LXXVIII, 1914, 114.

I cite *Rh.* by pages as numbered in *Proc. Brit. Acad.*; the numbering, but not the pagination, differs in the separate issues. It can readily be found by a simple calculation. The writing *ŷ* affected by Rhys, about the time he was knighted, may well yield to *y* except when quoted directly from his own title-pages.

- FrON* Hermann Gröhler, *Über Ursprung und Bedeutung der französischen Ortsnamen*, 2 volumes, Heidelberg, 1913-1933.
- NLF* Auguste Longnon, *Les noms de lieu de la France* (edited by P. Marichal and L. Mirot), Paris, 1920-29.  
Cf. Albert Dauzat, *La Toponymie française*, Paris, 1939.
- Henri Hubert, *Les Celtes*, 2 volumes, Paris, 1932. Cf. the criticisms of J. Toutain in *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, CXIV, 1936, 222-235.
- Mnl.* Albert Grenier, *Manuel d'archéologie gallo-romaine*, Paris, I, 1931, II i-ii, 1934; continues Déchelette's *Manuel d'arch. préhistorique, celtique et gallo-rom.*
- DA* *Dictionnaire archéologique de la Gaule*, 2 volumes, Paris, 1875-1919.
- M.-C.* Ernest Muret and Anatole Chabouillet, *Catalogue des monnaies gauloises de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Département des médailles et antiques), Paris, 1889.
- Atl.* Henri de la Tour, *Atlas de monnaies gauloises*, Paris, 1892.
- Tr.* Adrien Blanchet, *Traité des monnaies gauloises*, 2 volumes, Paris, 1905, supplemented by the same author's "Chronique de numismatique celtique," *Rev. celt.* XXVIII, 1907, 73-78; XXIX, 1908, 72-79; XXX, 1909, 189-197; XXXI, 1910, 49-59; XXXII, 1911, 396-406; XXXIV, 1913, 397-405; XXXIX, 1922, 338-347; XLVIII, 1931, 149-162.
- HG* Camille Jullian, *Histoire de la Gaule*, I-VIII Paris, 1908-26.  
There is a bibliography of the prodigious and in part misdirected output of C. Jullian (see Arnold J. Toynbee's witty criticisms in *A Study of History* I [Oxford and London, 1934], 11-12), compiled by Maurice Toussaint and published in *Revue des questions historiques*, CXXII 2, mars 1935, 179-214; CXXIII-CXXIV 3, mai 1935, 35-62.
- REA* *Revue des Études Anciennes*, Bordeaux and Paris, since 1899; contains valuable "chroniques gallo-romaines, notes gallo-romaines, d'archéologie gallo-romaine, d'archéologie rhénane," and "chroniques de toponymie."  
Tables analytiques des Tomes I à XV (1899-1913), 1933.
- RC* *Revue Celtique* I-LI, Paris, 1870-1934.  
Tables des volumes I-VI (1886), VII-XII (1891), XIII-XVIII (1898), XIX-XXIV (1906), XXV-XXX (1911), XXXI-XLV (1928).



- ZfCPH*      *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, Halle, since 1896.  
               Register, Bände I–V in V (1904–05); VI–X in X (1915),  
               XI–XV in XVI (1927).
- ZNF*         *Zeitschrift für Ortsnamenforschung*, Munich and Berlin,  
               1925–1937, I–XII, XIII i; continued as *Zeitschrift für*  
               *Namenforschung*, Berlin, XIII ii ff., since 1937.  
               Register, Bände I–XIII (1925–1938), Berlin, 1939.

## II. INTRODUCTORY

As the language of official use in the Roman empire, Latin came to be extended, more or less completely, to many peoples of many different nationalities and civilizations, and, above all, of different speech-habits. What Augustus saw with his own eyes, Vergil pictures Aeneas as seeing, as it were prophetically, upon the shield made for him by Vulcan. The peoples of the empire had not only their peculiar appearance and garb, like the Gauls who had scaled the Capitoline hill long before empire was dreamt of,<sup>4</sup> but also diversity of language —

*incedunt uictae longo ordine gentes,  
 quam uariae linguis, habitu tam uestis et armis.*<sup>5</sup>

This is commonplace enough; so too is a more explicit assertion about differences of speech in Gaul. What Caesar wrote about the differences to be observed there *lingua institutis legibus*,<sup>6</sup> may be found also in Strabo;<sup>7</sup> it appears further that this information was to be had in the older writer Posidonius, from whom, it is maintained, Caesar and Strabo in fact drew it independently.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>4</sup> *Aen.*, VIII 659–662.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, 722–723.

<sup>6</sup> *B.G.* I 1.2.

<sup>7</sup> IV 1.1, C 176.

<sup>8</sup> It is clear that *B.G.* I 1 goes back to Posidonius, and therefore describes a state of affairs that obtained at a time somewhat earlier than Caesar's own, say c. 80 B.C. On the sources of *B.G.* I 1 and of Strabo IV 1.1, see Karl Barwick, "Caesars Commentarium und das Corpus Caesarianum," *Philologus*, Supplementband XXI 2, 1938; Franz Beckmann, *Geographie und Ethnographie in Caesars Bellum Gallicum*, Dortmund, 1930 (cf. E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica*, II 1933, 175 n. 2); A. Klotz, "Geographie und Ethnographie in Caesars Bellum Gallicum," *Rheinisches Museum*, LXXXIII 1934, 66–96, especially 74–87; Matilde Truscelli, "I Κελτικά di Posidonio e loro influsso sulla posteriore etnografia," *Rend. d. r. Acc. naz. dei Lincei*, Cl. di

Knowledge of the western provinces of the empire has grown greatly through archaeological discoveries, even within recent decades. Excavation has been active especially in the Rhineland, and also in France and Holland, and in Belgium. It is not claimed, indeed, that there is a neat agreement of dialectal and cultural areas of a kind that is so striking in the map of pre-Roman Italy. But it would be mere folly to deny the existence of dialectal areas in pre-Roman Gaul just because a detailed map, like that of Italy, with its dozen or so ancient dialects, is more a vision than a reality. The fact is that the dialects of Gaul are ill documented merely because the art of writing hardly was diffused in Gaul (except in Provence) in advance of the spread of the Latin language. This lack of direct evidence, however, may be in some measure countered by indirect evidence. The systematic study of Latin inscriptions and of notices in ancient writers encourages the hope that a more precise meaning can be given to the remark, recorded by some early but acute or well-informed observer,

sc. mor., stor. e filol., serie sesta, XI 1935, 609-730, where (697) a reconstruction of Posidonius on tripartite Gaul is attempted. See also, more generally, Giorgio Pasquali, "Cesare, Platone e Posidonio," *Studi ital. di filologia classica*, nuova serie, VIII 1930-31, 297-301 (also on *B.G.* VI 13-14).

The same tradition is echoed by Ammianus Marcellinus XV 11. 1-3.

On all this see Ernst Kalinka, "Cäsar und die Fortsetzer seiner Werke: Bericht über das Schrifttum der Jahre 1929-36," *Bursians Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, CCLXIV (1939), 169-256, especially 190, 201-202 (with the references to Eduard Norden, *Die germanische Urgeschichte in Tacitus Germania*, ed. 3, 1923, 365); Friedrich Frahm, "Cäsar und Tacitus als Quelle für die altgermanische Verfassung," *Historische Vierteljahrschrift* XXIV 1928, 152; W. Capelle, "Poseidonius der Entdecker der 'nordischen' Völker," *Geistige Arbeit*, IV 1937, xi, 7-9, gives a "popular" account.

On an allied topic see F. Frahm, "Die Entwicklung des Suebenbegriffs in der antiken Literatur," *Klio*, XXIII 1929, 181-210.

The relevant place in Strabo may be quoted:

οἱ μὲν δὴ τριχῇ διήρουν, Ἀκυιτανούς καὶ Βέλγας καλοῦντες καὶ Κέλτας τοὺς μὲν Ἀκυιτανούς τελέως ἐξηλλαγμένους οὐ τῇ γλώττῃ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς σώμασιν . . . τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς Γαλατικοὺς μὲν τὴν ὄψιν, ὁμογλώττους δ' οὐ πάντας, ἀλλ' ἐνίοις μικρὸν παραλλάττοντας ταῖς γλώτταις, κτλ.

On this see Robert Munz, "Über γλώττα und διάλεκτος und über ein posidonianisches Fragment bei Strabo: ein sprachwissenschaftlich-philologischer Excurs zu Posidonius bei Strabo C 176 über dialektische Verschiedenheiten bei den Galliern," *Glotta* XI 1921, 85-94.

about varieties of language and customs among the tribes of north-western Europe.

Let us begin, then, with Caesar's opening statement, which, as every schoolboy knows, was not intended to include Narbonensis, despite the fact that it begins with the words *Gallia . . . omnis*: "Gaul, taken as a whole, is divided into three parts, one of which is inhabited by Belgae, another by Aquitani, and the third by people who are called in their own language 'Kelts' and in Latin 'Gauls.' All these differ from one another in language, institutions, and laws. The 'Gauls' are separated from the Aquitani by the river Garonne, from the Belgae by the Marne and the Seine." These first words of Caesar's *de bello Gallico*<sup>9</sup> are so well known as hardly to need quotation, so

<sup>9</sup> *Gallia est omnis diuisa in partes tres, quarum unam incolunt Belgae, aliam Aquitani, tertiam qui ipsorum lingua Celtae, nostra Galli appellantur. hi omnes lingua institutis legibus inter se differunt. Gallos ab Aquitanis Garunna flumen, a Belgis Matrona et Sequana diuidit (B.G. I, 1. 1-2).*

*Gallus*, *Galli* was the Latin name for the invaders who sacked Rome in 390 B.C. Any country which they occupied could be called, by the same name, *Gallia*. Why they were so called we do not know. The etymology of their name and its source are likewise unknown. It may have been an appellative, and, if so, it may have meant "warrior," or "foreign, strange." Or it may have been a tribal or local name, the name that is of the tribe where, or of the locality, in which, the Romans first learned to know "Gauls." But in no sense was it, or could it be, a national or political designation. Only after the conquest by Caesar was *Gallia* accepted, in the administrative language of Rome, with the more exact geographical meaning, common to the historians of imperial and all later times, which will be stated presently (p. 20).

On the names *Celtae*, *Galli*, Κελτοί, Γαλάται in Latin and Greek writers generally, see H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, "Les Celtes et les langues celtiques," *Revue archéologique*, nouv. sér., I 1882, 87-95, 141-154 (add to his references Diod. Sic. V 32.1). For another suggestion (*gallus*, cf. *Becco*) see *REA* XII 1910, 295.

The sham hare "Celtae and Galli" started by Rhys, *Transactions of the Philological Society*, London, 1891-94, 104-131, was shown to be what it was by E. Zupitza, "Kelten und Gallier," *ZfCPh* IV 1902-03, 1-22. Rhys still pretended that it was a live hare, *Proc. Br. Acad.* II 1905-06, 71-134, warily avoiding the mention of Zupitza's name. But Zupitza had the better of the argument. Cf. R. Thurneysen in *ZfCPh* VI 1907-08, 244-245.

The modern name *Gaule*, *Gaul* is another story, yet to be told. Albert Sjögren, *Studia Neophilologica*, XI 1938-39, 210-214, has the suggestion that it comes from Wace who adopted in his *Roman de Brut* the local name [*La*] *Gaule* (several hamlets near Caen and Bayeux), which he knew had in scholastic Latin traditionally been

forthright in what they affirm as hardly to need interpretation. Yet they have become the text of many a laborious dissertation. For example, the long discussion, in many chapters, which the late T. E. Rice Holmes, who had no taste for nonsense or humbug, felt himself obliged to write<sup>10</sup> about the peoples of pre-Roman and Roman Gaul, shows clearly how the words of Caesar have been obscured by a superimposed mass of modern, and silly, interpretation and argument.

In part the dispute is perverse. No one reading without preconception the simple statement *ipsorum lingua Celtae, nostra Galli, appellantur* could take it to mean other or more than what it says, namely that a certain people whom Caesar had encountered in a large stretch of territory between the Garonne and the Marne called themselves by a different name from that by which Caesar himself and other speakers of Latin were wont to designate them. That is all. Caesar says nothing, it ought to be unnecessary to point out, about "Kelts" as distinguished from Gauls. He merely mentions two different names, a native one and a foreign one, of one and the same people. Who in his senses would maintain that the Welsh are a different people from the Cymry, the Allemands (or Germans) from the Deutsche, the Graeci from the Hellenes? Yet this is precisely what Rhys did.

But in part the dispute springs from the desire to know more about the differences which Caesar declared existed "in language" and in other matters between the Belgae, Celtae (or Galli), and Aquitani. It springs also from carelessness or absence of definition, and as we proceed it will be necessary to make clear the meanings in which we use *Gallia* or Gaul (a purely geographical term) and *Keltic* (a purely linguistic term) as well as *Galli* or Gauls, which we shall use consistently in the meaning "inhabitants of Gaul, *Gallia*" (as defined). That part of the dispute which is perverse may be left to the fate which awaits all perverse disputes, a fate which in fact already has overtaken it. But the desire to discover just how those three peoples differed in language from one another and from their neighbors is legitimate

---

*Gallia*, as an equivalent also of the name of the classical Latin *Gallia*. But I am reluctant to believe that the extremely common and well established *Gaule* is a mere literary accident; besides, the manuscripts of Wace actually have *Gaulle* as well as *Gaule*. *Gallia* would, of course, normally become \**Jaille* in French.

<sup>10</sup> *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*, ed. 2, Oxford, 1911, 257-338.



enough. It is an enquiry easily trapped in the pitfalls of excess of zeal and misplaced ingenuity. In the effort to shun them it is not necessary, however, to go to the other extreme of inhibiting common sense, and of doubting whether any of the inscriptions known as Gaulish are in a Keltic language.<sup>11</sup> And in all that has been written on this subject, one thing at least has been done neither by Rhys nor by Dottin, nor by any one else who has written about the Keltic dialects of Gaul, and that is: so to arrange the linguistic evidence as to show clearly what truth, if any, there is in Caesar's assertion, on the basis of the materials now extant. Caesar, or his authority, is not indeed made a liar, merely if the assertion cannot be justified on that basis, for the basis itself may now be inadequate. No one was so learned or so unlearned, or at least no one so interested, in Caesar's own day, as to have disputed the statement. Its truth was as self-evident as a comparable statement made to-day about India or South America.

We must be content, therefore, with what evidence we have, and not attempt to go beyond it. But the required arrangement of the evidence demands two simple rules of procedure: first, an orderly geographical classification of it, the broadest outlines of which Caesar himself has given us; and, second, a rigid separation of what is certain from what is merely probable. To these I have added a third rule, which needs no justification, that is to reject the irrelevant. The materials which will be offered have been severely selected from a mass of records, on the principle of admitting only those which throw light on the dialectal conditions of pre-Roman Gaul.

It is necessary, however, to extend somewhat the geographical limits with which Caesar begins. Taking into consideration only the Galli, we know that other peoples called by this name lived in ancient times in other parts of Europe, as well as in Gaul. On the other hand, at *B.G.* I 1, 1 Caesar, in his threefold partition of Gaul, uses the term *Gallia* in a narrower sense than that in which the imperial provincial administration used it, or in which it is commonly understood. Any enquiry, therefore, into the linguistic situation in ancient Gaul, must take into account any other ancient dialects that may have existed

<sup>11</sup> See the *Transactions of the Philological Society* (London), 1933, 102. The opposite view is strongly stated by C. Julian, *HG* II 1903, 360-375, especially 371 n. 6, 366 n. 3 ad fin.

there in addition to the three which Caesar specifies ("Belgic, Celtic, Aquitanian"); and also, granted that one (or more than one) of such dialects (taken all together) belonged to that subdivision of the Indo-European languages which modern philologists, using the ancient name, call Keltic, must take some account, by way of comparison, of related dialects spoken outside of the boundaries of Gaul, as for example in the adjacent territories of Germany, Switzerland, and Italy — not to mention the ancient Keltic dialect of Galatia.<sup>12</sup>

It was, in fact, the study of the problems presented by the Lepontic inscriptions and by the remains of Ligurian as well as of Keltic in Gallia Cisalpina, that led naturally to the present study. At first the intention was simply to deal with the texts of those non-Latin and non-Greek inscriptions of ancient Gaul which are commonly regarded as Keltic. Then the plan gradually took shape of presenting a linguistic survey of Gaul as a whole, *Gallia omnis*.

Even from the little that has been said about "Keltic" dialects and about "Gaul," it will be evident that both of these terms require definition. Definitions, it need hardly be said, properly come at the end, not at the beginning, of an investigation. If, therefore, it is possible to define the terms *Keltic* and *Gallia* here, without further delay, that is because their meanings have been made sufficiently clear by previous investigations.

It is a little over one hundred years since Franz Bopp, in 1838,<sup>13</sup> demonstrated, what had been doubted or denied, namely, that the Keltic languages are Indo-European, though that essential fact had been stated by Sir William Jones in 1786 and recognized by Rasmus Rask in 1818;<sup>14</sup> and, since 1853, the year in which the *Grammatica Cel-*

<sup>12</sup> On this see now L. Weisgerber, "Galatische Sprachreste," in *Natalicium Johannes Geffcken*, Heidelberg, 1931, 151-175, reviewed by J. Vendryes, *RC* XLIX 1932, 299-300.

<sup>13</sup> *Die celtischen Sprachen in ihrem Verhältnisse zum Sanskrit usw.*, Berlin, 1839 (Gelesen in der Akademie der Wissenschaften am 13. Dec. 1838).

<sup>14</sup> In a letter dated 11 June 1818, see Rask's *Samlede . . . Afhandlinger* II 1836, 281: Denne (vor) Raseinddeler jeg således: *den indiske* (den dekaniske, hindostanske), *irâniske* (pers. armen. osset.), *trakiske* (graeske og latinske), *sarmatiske* (lettiske og slaviske), *gotiske* (gjerman. og skandinav.) og *keltiske* (brittaniske og gæliske) Stammer eller Folke og *Sprogklasse*. Sir William Jones' famous statement of 1786 is quoted in every text-book and need not be repeated here. It will be seen that by

*lica* appeared, their chief characteristics have been made well known.<sup>15</sup> By Keltic, then, we understand that variety of western Indo-European speech<sup>16</sup> which is recognizable both by those features that it possesses in common with other Indo-European languages, and also, more particularly, by those peculiar features of its own that distinguish it among them; and which we find to be spoken in modern times in Brittany, Cornwall, Wales, the Isle of Man, Ireland, and Scotland (not to mention the Welsh-speaking colony of Patagonia), and to have been spoken in ancient times in Great Britain and Ireland, in Gaul (except in the corner between the river Garonne and the Pyrenees mountains), and at least temporarily in many parts of the central European, Alpine, and Danubian regions, in some parts of the Spanish, Italian, and Balkan peninsulas; and in Asia Minor. The term Keltic, therefore, applies properly to language and to language only. The extension of it so as to designate people ("Kelts") is justified when and only when it is restricted to the meaning "Keltic-speaking" at that period at which it is known the people who are designated Keltic were actually Keltic-speaking. In any other usage the term is misleading if not meaningless. Thus we can say that Keltic speech was in use in certain parts of Gaul in the last century before Christ, and we may designate the communities, who used such a speech, as Keltic or Keltic-speaking, so long and only so long as they used it, but not, for example, after they had discarded that speech and learned Latin in its place.

---

1818 Rask had revised his earlier opinion, set forth in his prize-essay "Undersøgelse om det gamle Nordiske eller Islandske Sprogs Oprindelse" (1814, first published in 1818, now reprinted in *Udvalgte Afhandlinger* [*Ausgewählte Abhandlungen*] of Rask, edited by L. Hjelmslev, 1932), that Keltic is not Indo-European, but owes its Indo-European elements to borrowing.

<sup>15</sup> For readers of this monograph the most useful summaries are those of Ernst Windisch, "Keltische Sprache," in Gröber, *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie* I, ed. 2, 1904-06, 371-404, or of Julius Pokorny, "Kelten: B. Sprache," in Ebert, *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*, VI 1926, 296-300. Cf. H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, *Éléments de la Grammaire celtique*, Paris, 1903. Those who desire detail may be referred to Pedersen, *VKG*.

On the progress of Keltic studies see R. Thurneysen, "Die keltischen Sprachen," in Streitberg, *Geschichte der Indogermanischen Sprachwissenschaft* II 1 1916, 281-305.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Hubert, *Les Celtes* I 23-40, where the fact is emphasized more than once, that the "Kelts" are not a race or people, but a group of communities or societies, one of the most clearly marked characteristics of which is their language.



As for ancient Gaul, we appeal not only to the large group of people living there called, according to Latin and Greek testimony, *Celtae* or *Κελτοί* by themselves and often also by ancient writers, so that their communities are called by the adjective *celticus* or *κελτικός*, terms which are also used by ancient glossographers and other writers to describe their speech and certain words quoted by them from it, both as it was then current in Roman Gaul and in other regions where that speech and its dialects were or had been current; but we appeal also to the long history of certain dialects spoken in the British Isles and in Brittany, reaching down to modern times, dialects which linguistic comparison proves beyond all doubt to be kindred to the ancient Keltic dialect or dialects of Gaul as recorded in those mere isolated fragments, so that the name is justifiably extended to cover all of these; and further we appeal to other linguistic remnants, to which allusion has already been made, found in Gaul itself, and proved by the same method, to belong to the same subdivision of the entire group of dialects as Welsh and Cornish and Breton. There would seem, then, to be no possibility of misunderstanding what is meant by the term "Keltic," whether generally or (more particularly) with reference to ancient Gaul.

The relation of Keltic, as we have defined Keltic, to other Indo-European languages has often been discussed,<sup>17</sup> and again recently by J. Vendryes.<sup>18</sup> It is necessary here to narrow the discussion to the ancient Keltic idioms of Gaul. The fact is familiar, that recorded forms such as *petuar*[, *pinpetos*, *epocal(l)ium*, *petrudecameto* (Gélignieux, Ain), with *p*, do not pass unchallenged, but are confronted by other forms such as *equos* (Coligny, Ain), *Sequana*, with *qu*; and hence a most telling shibboleth would seem to have lost its usefulness.<sup>19</sup> Two, in part

<sup>17</sup> By none better than by Holger Pedersen "Le groupement des dialectes indo-européens," *Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser*, XI 3, 1925.

<sup>18</sup> "La position linguistique du Celtique," *Proc. Br. Acad.*, XXIII 1937, 333-371. Vendryes is wrong, by the way, in claiming *asia* as Keltic (336).

<sup>19</sup> But not in the way in which Iowerth C. Peate "The Kelts in Britain," *Antiquity*, VI 1932, 156-160, and "The Kelts: a Linguistic Contribution," *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, LXXXVII 1932, 260-264, argues. His "contribution" (!) is *nihil ad rem*. That of R. G. Collingwood in R. G. Collingwood and J. N. L. Myres, *Roman Britain and the English Settlements*, Oxford, 1936, 19 is worse. For it is pure non-

contradictory, admissions are made: (1) that in Gaul, the language so far as it was Keltic, agreed in general with Brythonic, despite the treatment of *ur-*, which gave *br-* (at least in some areas), but in Welsh *gwr-*, later *gr-*; and (2) that there was no unity of Keltic language in Gaul, that historical and political conditions as well as explicit testimony and archaeological evidence are all against the assumption of such a unity. We know that, before the Romans, the Kelts were the last people to arrive in Gaul, but also that they came in several waves of migration, at different times, and that their predecessors were not Keltic. Usually it is supposed that documentary evidence is completely lacking from which differences of dialect might be deduced, though it is admitted that not all the peoples of Gaul spoke Keltic even at the time of the Roman conquests, and that traces of language anterior to Keltic itself may be observed.

Nevertheless it is contended that proper names, particularly local names, which are something apart within the norm of a spoken language, show great uniformity from one end of Gaul to the other. Attention is called, however, to differences of distribution of certain types of proper names, local names in *-briga* "mount" being especially numerous in Celtiberia, names in *-ialum* "clearing" in certain parts of Gaul. Moreover, in addition to, or side by side with, Keltic proper names there are names, particularly of rivers and mountains, which do not show Keltic formations or Keltic words, or agree with the phonematic or other usage of Keltic, and these are thought to be anterior to Keltic. As examples are quoted the names of mountains *Alpes*, *Morvan*, *Cévennes* (to quote the modern forms), and of rivers *Arar*, *Elauer*, *Garunna*, *Icauna*, *Liger*, *Rodanus*, *Samara*, *Tarnis*, and of towns *Agedincum*, *Durocortorum*. Despite, therefore, the Keltic alternation, as it would appear, of *p:qu*, or the alleged, but extremely doubtful, loss of initial *s* (as in Brythonic), it is conjectured that traces

---

sense to write "It is now held . . . that the Q-variety" [of Keltic] "arose in Ireland, perhaps in the third century before Christ, by a change of *p* into *q*." If Professor J. R. R. Tolkien, who helped Mr Collingwood "untiringly with problems of Celtic philology" (vii), is the author of this extraordinary gaff, he must stand alone in it. Irish preserves Kelt. *qʷ* (from I. Eu. *qʷ*) as late as the Ogam period, later it has *kʷ* and the normal subsequent development *kʷ*. True, Latin *p*, in the oldest borrowings, is identified with *qʷ* in Irish; later it is *p*.

of Iberian speech in south-west Gaul, and of Ligurian in south-east Gaul, are to be found; or so it was conjectured, for one authority, completely carried away by the now fashionable Illyriomania, would substitute "Illyrian" for Ligurian in the latter area. Finally, King Charles' head, or the atavistic "substratum," reappears from time to time, when traces of Keltic or of Keltic influence, are proclaimed to exist, not merely in the vulgar Latin of Gaul, but also in the French language, and not merely in its vocabulary but also in other features, at various times in its history.

Thus we have a certain number of Keltic words surviving into modern French, e.g., *alouette*, *vergne*, *lieue*, *arpent*, *marne*, *ouche*, *marchais*, *breuil*.<sup>20</sup> The fact is not surprising; and the ascription of *ixi* "ipsi" at Suetonius *Aug.* 88 to a Gaul is plausible, since the change from *ps* to *xs* in Keltic is universal. But it is more doubtful whether there is justification for the comparison of French with Irish constructions and prepositions which Vendryes<sup>21</sup> suggests. Far less remote and far more convincing is the comparison between Keltic multipersonal passive forms in Welsh and Irish, and the Gaulish *marcosior*, if that is correctly interpreted as a passive verbal form. Doubts too are awakened by Vendryes' appeal to "substratum" in Keltic, Etruscan, and Italic, the "substratum" in this case being supposed to be ancient, Mediterranean, and pre-Indo-European.

Within Indo-European itself, however, it is a commonplace observation that Keltic has many items of vocabulary and grammar shared in common with Germanic<sup>22</sup> and Italic, or with both, e.g. Gaulish

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Dottin *REA* VII 1905, 42-44.

<sup>21</sup> 369.

<sup>22</sup> The subject demands more accurate study than that given to it by C. S. Elston, *The Earliest Relations between Celts and Germans*, London, 1934 (see the reviews by M. L. Sjoestedt, *RC* LI 1934, 305-309, H. Krahe, *Idg. Forsch.*, LII 1934, 258-259, and by G. Neckel in *Deutsche Lit.-ztg.*, LV 1934, 1797-98), or by Sigmund Feist, *Indogermanen und Germanen* ed. 3, Halle, 1924, 71-77, and *Germanen und Kelten in der antiken Überlieferung*, Halle, 1927 (see the review by W. Steinhauser in *ZfCPH*, XVII 1928, 423-426). Among older discussions note J. Mansion, "Kelten en Germanen," *Verslagen en Mededeelingen der koninklijke vlaamische Academie voor Taal en Letterkunde*, Gent, 1912, 1293-1308 (cf. 1285-1286, and the summary in French, *REA* XV 1913, 198-199), H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, *Celtes et Germains*, Paris, 1886 (from *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 4e série, XIII 1885 [published 1886], 316-325, where it appeared under a different

*celicnon*, which appears to mean some kind of building or structure, cf. Gothic *kēlikn* "upper-room, tower;" but this agreement, like many others (e.g. Ir. *marc* "horse") in Vendryes' list of words dealing with warfare, is due to borrowing.<sup>23</sup> On the other hand, Keltic and Italic have a great many features in common, not by borrowing, but, so to speak, by inheritance, notably a large number of words connected with religion.<sup>24</sup>

title, "Unité primitive des Italo-celtes, relations de l'empire celtique avec les Germains antérieurement au second siècle avant notre ère"), and most recently J. Pokorny in *ZfCPh* XX 1936, 500-508; cf. H. Hirt, *Indogermanische Grammatik* I 1927, 57-59, id., *Handbuch des Urgermanischen*, I 1931, 11-13. It is well to recall the distinctions implied by Caesar *B.G.* I, 47 (cf. VI 21-24) and by Tacitus *Germ.* 2.5 (on the text see the conjectures of R. Meissner and E. B[ickel], *Rh. Mus.*, LXXXVIII 1939, 379-384).

The first attempt to grapple seriously with this problem was perhaps that of Adolf Holtzmann, *Kelten und Germanen*, Stuttgart, 1855, quickly followed by the more painstaking H. B. Christian Brandes, *Das ethnographische Verhältniss der Kelten und Germanen*, Leipzig, 1857. Some recent judgements must be read with caution (Gustav Neckel, "Germanen und Kelten," *Zeitschrift für Deutschkunde*, XLVII 1933, 497-574; Rudolf Much, "Kelten und Germanen," *Volk und Rasse*, III 1928, 143-154 and 193-201). A. Schulten, "Germanen und Gallier," *Forschungen und Fortschritte*, VIII 1932, 121-122, argues that "Germanen" reached Spain in the sixth century B.C.!

Some further bibliographical items will be given in connexion with Germania inferior in the main body of the work. Add M. Mauss, *Rev. de Synthèse*, XVII 1939, 22-23; M. Dillon, *JEGP* XLII 1943, 492-498.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Vendryes, *RC*, XLIX 1932, 300 (citing Weisgerber) on the possibility that both *kēlikn* and *siponeis* came into Gothic from Galatian rather than from Gaulish. On *siponeis* see, in addition to R. Much in *Beiträge zur Gesch. der deutschen Spr. u. Lit.*, XVII 1892, 33 and W. Luft in *Zts. f. deutsches Altertum*, XLI 1897, 239 (both cited by S. Feist, *Etym. Wtb. der gotischen Sprache* ed. 2, 1933, s.v.), A. Cuny *REA* XII, 1910, 15. Add also Carl J. S. Marstrander, "A Celto-Germanic Correspondence of Vocabulary," *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap*, VII 1934, 347-349; id., "Une correspondance germano-celtique," *Skrifter utgit av Videnskapselskapet i Kristiania* 1924, II Historisk-filosofisk Klasse, 8. But Collitz, *AJP* XLVI 1925, was quite wrong in his guess (σύμπονος).

<sup>24</sup> See, in general, Richard von Kienle, "Italiker und Kelten," *Wörter und Sachen*, XVII 1936, 98-153; J. Vendryes, "Italique et Celtique," *RC* XLII 1925, 379-390; A. Walde, "Über älteste sprachliche Beziehungen zwischen Kelten und Italikern," *Rektoratsschrift*, Innsbruck, 1917; on Rhys *loc. cit.* n. 9 supra ("The Celts and other Aryans of the P and Q groups," *Trans. Phil. Soc.*, 1891), see the criticisms of J. Loth in Vollmöller's *Kritischer Jahresbericht*, IV 1895-96: i 44-46. Recent



The Roman or greater Gaul of which we have spoken extended beyond the frontiers of modern France, for it stretched as far east as the Rhine so as to include, besides Alsace and Lorraine (which at present are no longer French), the western and north-western lowlands of Switzerland from Geneva to the western end of lake Constance; the Rhenish provinces of Germany; Luxembourg, Belgium, and the southern part of the Netherlands. Thus, for the ancients, Gallia in the broad sense of the term meant the north-western land-mass of continental Europe, enclosed by the Mediterranean and the Pyrenees on the south, by the Atlantic and the English channel on the west and north, by the Rhine and the Alps on the east.<sup>25</sup> Galli are inhabitants of Gallia. This is a greater than Caesar's Gallia too, for he excluded the Roman province into which, after the Civil War, the territory of Massilia was to be incorporated. But then there are also certain frontier-districts, lying between Germany, Raetia, and Italy, which were more or less Keltic in character, and of which, therefore, it is convenient and, for the purposes of a linguistic enquiry, proper to take account. The peculiar organization of some of these regions sufficiently indicates the difficulties which the Roman imperial administrators themselves felt, on territorial and other administrative grounds, in including them in the adjacent provinces. In addition to the three military districts between Italy and the province of southern Gaul, there was the *uallis Poenina*, corresponding roughly to the modern canton Wallis of Switzerland; that part of the country of the Keltic Vindelici in the

scepticism on the agreements between Italic and Keltic (see, e.g., C[arl] M[arstrand] "De l'unité italo-celtique," *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap*, III 1929, 241-259, and "A West-Indoeuropean Correspondence of Vocabulary," VII 1934, 335-343) has gone too far. But the views of C. Jullian "L'Époque italo-celtique," *REA*, XVIII 1916, 263-276; XIX 1917, 125-133; XX 1918, 43-46, were just as extreme. Something may be gleaned from J. Vendryes, "Mélanges italo-celtiques," in *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, XIII 1905-06, 384-408 (cf. *ZfCPh*, VI 1907-08, 251), *id.*, "Les correspondances de vocabulaire entre l'indo-iranien et l'italo-celtique," XX 1918, 265-285 (summary in *Rev. arch.* 5e sér., VIII 1918, 347), and from G. Devoto "Italo-greco e Italo-celtico," in *Sillogie linguistica dedicata alla memoria di Graziadeo Isaia Ascoli*, Turin, 1929, 200-240 (*Arch. Glott. Ital.*, XXII-XXIII). Cf. Vendryes, *EC* II 1937, 405; Bonfante, *Emerita* II 1934, 263-306; *Riv. IGI* XIX 1935, 49-69; M. Dillon, *AJP* LXV 1944, 124-134.

<sup>25</sup> The evidence is assembled by Holder *AcS* I, s.v. Gallia (1896); cf. J. Toutain in E. de Ruggiero, *Dizionario epigrafico di antichità romane*, s.v. Gallia (1905).



map I



GAUL AT THE TIME OF CAESAR

northern province of Raetia (later Raetia secunda), which, on their western confines, adjoined Gaul proper; and the *agri decumates*, which lay between Gaul and Germany — in all, therefore:

#### I. ALPINE REGIONS

1. Alpes Maritimae
2. Regnum Cottii
3. Alpes Graiae
4. Vallis Poenina

#### II. GAUL PROPER

1. Narbonensis
2. Aquitania
3. Lugdunensis
4. Belgica
5. Germania inferior
6. Germania superior

#### III. MIDDLE RHINE AND UPPER DANUBE

1. Agri decumates
2. Vindelici

The maps set forth the republican and imperial subdivisions of Gaul. I have used the latter for the purposes of a geographical classification of the dialectal evidence, (1) because most of it is actually of imperial date; (2) because the dialects were not, or at least Keltic was not, extinct before the third century of our era; and (3) because the imperial subdivision provides areas more instructive and also more manageable than Caesar's or Strabo's do.<sup>26</sup> (Caesar's tripartite division, let us recall, is not his own, but that of Posidonius.) It must be understood that the precise boundaries of the imperial subdivisions cannot be accurately indicated, for they are not accurately known. Still

<sup>26</sup> It is not worth while to give a sketch of Strabo's Gaul (with the Pyrenees running north and south). Those who want it may find a map of sorts in the Loeb Strabo, II.

The two Germanies (*inferior* and *superior*) were "im officiellen Sprachgebrauch keine Provinzen, sondern regiones oder dioeceses der Provinz Belgica im weitern Sinn;" this truth (Mommsen, *Gesammelte Schriften* VIII, 1913, 153-154) cannot be too much emphasized.



GAUL AT THE TIME OF AUGUSTUS

later divisions, whereby there was set up a varying number of provinces, are of no interest here.<sup>27</sup>

In its main features the history of the latinization, this term being used in its strictest (i.e. linguistic) sense, is very similar in Gaul to what it had been in Italy. In both lands there are records of languages spoken before the spread of Latin, and some hints, but no actual records, of still others. Moreover we do not suppose that the ancestors of the people whose linguistic remains are the oldest known to us in either Gaul or Italy were dumb. What we have to ask is the question what languages, so far as we can now tell, were spoken in the several regions of Gaul and its frontier-districts before the spread of Romance (that is Latin) or Germanic speech. The ultimate fate of the pre-Latin dialects in Gaul, as in Italy, was that at last they were abandoned, almost everywhere, in favor of other forms of speech, usually Latin. And if, as some hold, modern Greek is in Italy nowhere descended from the ancient Greek of Magna Graecia, a view mentioned here only for the sake of comparison and not because it is thought to be truer than the opposite theory, no more is Breton in France descended from the ancient Keltic dialect of Brittany, but (like Albanian in Italy) was introduced there from outside. But Basque, spoken in the arrondissements of Bayonne and Mauléon, is usually maintained to be descended from Iberian, spoken in the ancient Aquitania and presumably anterior to Keltic.

To repeat, then, we must ask, not what was the Iberian or the Ligurian language respectively of Aquitania or eastern Narbonensis, for in that form the question implies a denial of the sure fact that a more or less racially stable people on occasion does change its language as easily as its culture; but, rather, what languages were spoken, at successive periods, in Aquitania or in Gaulish (and in Italian) Liguria; and likewise with respect to the other regions of Gaul proper and to the frontier-districts. We are entitled, moreover, once these questions have been answered, also to assign geographical names, for example Iberian or Ligurian, to certain of their dialects, if only as a

<sup>27</sup> A recent discussion may be had of Herbert Nesselhauf, "Die spätrömische Verwaltung der gallisch-germanischen Länder" (*Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1938, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 2), pp. 8-21; cf. Grenier, *Mnl.* I 138-141.





GAUL IN THE SECOND AND THIRD CENTURIES AFTER CHRIST

means of identification, and then to ask what were the affiliations of the dialects so designated. And these geographical names, it ought not to be necessary to point out, must not be assigned to fit some pre-conceived theory.

The very fact that Ligurians are known to have lived in Gaul as well as in Italy, if not the theory of d'Arbois de Jubainville and others that these Gaulish Ligurians at one time spoke a non-Keltic but nevertheless Indo-European speech, raises the question what had been the language or languages of this wider Liguria that straddled the Alpes Maritimae from Italy to Gaul, before Latin became its language. Again the fact that a Keltic language was brought into Italy from across the Alps about the beginning of the fourth century before Christ or the end of the preceding century, raises important questions of the relations between that Keltic dialect of north Italy and the Keltic dialects of Gaul, and also of the nature of the latinization in north Italy and Gaul respectively.

It is all the more necessary to consider these preliminary questions, since erroneous views concerning the answers to them are still bandied about by the reckless or prejudiced. First, then, the Ligurian question.<sup>28</sup> For the moment, the problem of the Narbonese inscriptions may be left in abeyance. What it is important to emphasise here is the incontestable fact that there was spoken in the ancient Liguria, before the use of Latin, an Indo-European language that cannot be classified as a dialect of any other Indo-European speech, but must be put in an independent place within that family of languages. The evidence even for this guarded form of statement has been given elsewhere, and I do not intend to repeat it. It is necessary, therefore, only to point out, first, that no argument has yet been advanced to alter that fact in the slightest degree; and hence, second, that the sole ques-

<sup>28</sup> I cannot enter into the problems raised by Eduard Mauritz Meijers, "Le droit ligurien de succession," *Revue d'histoire du droit*, V 1923-24, 1-32, elaborated in his larger work with the same title, published as *Rechtshistorisch Instituut*, Leiden, Ser. II. 2, vol. I 1928 ("Les Pays Alpains"), eagerly as Jullian welcomed any excuse for identifying Ligurian with "l'italo-celtique" (cf. Julien Havet, "Les institutions et le droit spéciaux aux italo-celtes," *RC* XXVIII, 1907, 113-116). Jullian's own attempts to separate Ligurian names of cities and rivers in France (*REA* III, 1901, 317; V, 1903, 28-29, cf. 36 n. 2; VIII, 1906, 250-252; 343; cf. XV, 1913, 453 n. 1) cannot be called successful.

tion that remains is whether or not the conclusion to which the evidence leads should be formulated in the general undefined shape in which it has just been stated above, and only so — and a more definite form of statement may indeed be modified to that extent, without making any essential change in my view; in other words, whether or not it is justifiable to give the conclusion a less vague shape by saying that the pre-Latin Indo-European speech of Liguria is appropriately to be described as Ligurian. The answer is that there are good and sufficient reasons for taking this further step.<sup>29</sup>

Next the Keltic dialect of north Italy. The gradual, but almost uninterrupted, process of supplanting the Keltic dialects has been at work in Europe for over two thousand years, until to-day Keltic is not commonly spoken anywhere except in restricted parts of the British Isles and Brittany. When and how did Keltic cease to be spoken in north Italy? That a Keltic dialect was spoken there before Latin is certain, and the general character of that Keltic dialect is also well known; that is to say, it belonged to that branch of Keltic known as *p*-Keltic, because it substituted, in part, labial plosives for the older Indo-European labio-velar plosives and also for the combination *kū*. Thus, like Welsh and Cornish *ebol* (*b* for older *p*), we have Keltic *epo*- in north Italy (*Eporedia*, *Epona*) in contrast with Irish *ech*, Venetic *e·kupeθari·s·*, *ecupetaris*, or even Umbrian *ekvine*. The interpretation “charioteer” of the Venetic word just cited was first proposed by Torp, and nothing that has been said against it since then either by Danielsson or by others is convincing; still less are the other interpretations suggested in its place. In general I often find myself in agreement with Pedersen’s conclusions, but not in his criticism of Torp’s brilliant explanation of that Venetic word.<sup>30</sup>

But comparisons of Keltic words with words in other Indo-European languages in Italy, apart from the well-known agreements on which the Italo-Keltic hypothesis was based, are not notably closer than with words in Indo-European languages outside Italy.<sup>31</sup> Nothing is gained, for example, by insisting on a comparison of Welsh *iach* “healthy” with Venetic *akeo*, even though Greek *ἀκέομαι* also regularly has the smooth breathing, for the absence of initial *i̇*- would be quite as irregu-

<sup>29</sup> See note A, pp. 77–80 below.

<sup>30</sup> See note B, pp. 80–82 below.

<sup>31</sup> See *Do.*, 126–132.

lar in Venetic as are the few forms with rough breathing (e.g. Delph. ἐφακέομαι) in Greek.<sup>32</sup> It is, moreover, certain that linguistically the Gauls had no lasting influence in Italy, apart from the well-known borrowings of single words into Latin; and, in fact, it is only in the western part of the country about the Po that "we can assume from the testimony of the inscriptions the existence of a compact Gaulish-speaking population."<sup>33</sup> This inscriptional evidence is of two kinds: first, the three isolated but actual Keltic inscriptions of Briona (Novara), Todi, and Zignago; and, second, the manifestly Keltic names which appear in "good measure, pressed down and running over" in the Latin inscriptions of Cisalpine Gaul. Mr D. O. Robson, of the University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, writes in opposition to my view (namely, that these Keltic names prove the survival of a rapidly latinized but previously Keltic-speaking population of the Po valley) that they "may equally well point to a much later influx." As to that, it need only be pointed out that the moon may be made of green cheese. The objections of a critic who confuses Hittite hieroglyphic and Hittite cuneiform need not, indeed, be taken very seriously, but the interpretation of an often-quoted place in Polybius<sup>34</sup> dealing with the latinization — or, from Polybius' point of view, the romanization — of Cisalpine Gaul, calls for more careful consideration.

Elsewhere<sup>35</sup> I have, like others before me,<sup>36</sup> interpreted that place in Polybius as being greatly exaggerated if taken in its literal meaning. From this view, which is at least no "mis-interpretation" of the facts, I see no reason to depart. In the first place, it has constantly to be remembered that even Greek writers about Italian affairs invariably tell their stories from the Roman point of view, and in the matter of the conquest of Cisalpine Gaul Polybius is no exception to the rule. Next, the very fact that the Romans had by no means done with the turbulent Alpine and Cisalpine tribes, even after the days of Polybius, proves that he exaggerated. Then the considerable evidence of Keltic

<sup>32</sup> See *Classical Philology*, XXXVI 1941, 409.

<sup>33</sup> H. Pedersen, *Linguistic Science in the Nineteenth Century*, 1931, 54.

<sup>34</sup> II 35.4; see note C, pp. 82-85 below.

<sup>35</sup> *Præ-Italic Dialects*, II 170; cf. *Foundations of Roman Italy*, 1937, 106, 153.

<sup>36</sup> E.g., H. Nissen, *Italische Landeskunde*, I 1883, 482; cf. von Duhn quoted, and Chilver cited, in nn. 176, 178 below.



cults, which, in Cisalpine Gaul, survived even the romanization,<sup>37</sup> above all that of the *matronae*, is perhaps the most convincing proof that the Gauls were not "expelled" or removed root and branch, so much as absorbed into the older population and, with the plantation of colonies, the spread of agriculture and commerce, and above all the adoption of Latin, became "extinct" in the sense that with the loss of their Gallic characteristics, and especially of their ancestral language, the descendants of the Gauls of Gallia Cisalpina ceased to be Kelts and became rather Italians in the course of the last two centuries B.C.

The process of romanization in Transalpine Gaul, then, was not essentially different from what it had been in Cisalpine Gaul;<sup>38</sup> it took place at later dates, and it operated on different tribes, that is all. Indeed it clearly must be regarded as substantially an extension, beyond the Alps, of that same process which in the end not merely justified but actually had compelled, when at last it could no longer be denied, the extension, as far as the Alps, of the Roman franchise even to the most Keltic part of Cisalpine Gaul, the Transpadana (49 B.C.).

There is, however, a great contrast between Narbonensis and the three Gauls, where the latinization was affected much more slowly and was not in fact completed before the sixth century of our era. The spread of Christianity had much to do with the introduction of Latin into the remoter parts of Gaul, and, outside of the towns and permanent camps, Christian preachers must have played at least as large a part as Roman soldiers, traders, and officials in spreading the Latin at the same time that they spread the faith of the Church. It is, therefore, all the more remarkable that a large proportion out of the total number of dialect inscriptions preserved to us in Gaul have been discovered in southern Gaul, which was earlier and more rapidly latinized, and not from the Tres Galliae, which maintained their Keltic speech longer and more tenaciously, thoroughly latinized as the whole of Gaul was in the long run.

<sup>37</sup> See *Foundations of Roman Italy*, 157-160; G. E. F. Chilver, *Cisalpine Gaul*, Oxford, 1941, 183-192.

<sup>38</sup> This was also Mommsen's view, *History of Rome*, Eng. tr. by W. P. Dickson, New York, 1872, IV 645-647.

But manifestly it would be absurd to conclude that in the Tres Galliae the Keltic-speaking people were exterminated, and not in Narbonensis. The true explanation is that the absence of written documents is part and parcel of their more persistent Kelticism. The druids refused to commit their traditional lore to writing, and all but the nobles, who were educated by the druids, remained illiterate. Thus there was no common practice of writing before the Latin language was introduced, and with it the free use of the art. Hence, when the people began to write at all, they did so, with hardly an exception, in Latin and in the Latin alphabet. The statement is sometimes made, especially in popular works, that just as Latin, the common language of the empire, was taken over by the Gauls, so the Latin alphabet was taken over by the Keltic languages. But this statement needs some modification. In general it may be said that in the Tres Galliae we find (except at Mont-Auxois) only the Latin alphabet in use for writing dialect inscriptions, in Narbonensis only the Greek alphabet; in Italy the North-Etruscan alphabet appears in all three extant Keltic inscriptions.

What is true of the three Gauls, is true at first also of Britain. The native Irish or *ogam* script was not only proper to Ireland, whence it spread to Wales, Cornwall, Scotland, and the Isle of Man; it is itself of uncertain origin.<sup>39</sup> It was never threatened by competition with Greek writing; on the other hand the Latin alphabet first began its triumphal progress, not yet stayed, beyond the borders of Italy, when it was adopted for writing the Keltic languages, not only of Gaul, but also of the British Isles. There can be no doubt that the people of Roman Britain generally spoke not Latin but British.<sup>40</sup> They did not

<sup>39</sup> Helmut Arntz maintains a Runic origin (see Müller's *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. W. Otto, VI *Handbuch der Archäologie*, 1939, 353-356, with the references to his earlier and fuller discussions, and to the criticisms of Thurneysen and Keller). Neither this view nor the commonly accepted derivation from the Latin alphabet is satisfactory; but at all events there is no question of a Gaulish origin, or of a native script peculiar to the Keltic peoples as a whole, even if *ogam* should be of independent Irish origin. In his article, "L'Écriture chez les Celtes," *RC* XLIV 1927, 1-13, unfortunately Loth takes Glozel seriously.

<sup>40</sup> See, for example, the conclusions of K. H. Jackson (in *Proceedings of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, 1935, 425), whose statement is to be preferred to that of R. G. Collingwood ap. T. Frank, *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*,

write it down, however. In Britain the speaking of Latin, among the officials and perhaps as a second language — a polite tongue of the upper classes — coincided roughly with the ability to read and write. Certainly we have in the end a very different situation from what obtained even in the three Gauls, where eventually Latin was established firmly and developed into a Romance language. Yet Latin was not without influence on the British tongue, as modern Welsh proves. Hence the Keltic epigraphic evidence from Britain, where the speakers of Keltic were by no means exterminated by the Romans, or for that matter by their Anglo-Saxon conquerors either, is insignificant and negligible, if not actually zero, as in fact more than once, erroneously, it has been declared to be.<sup>41</sup> But even if we have no British inscriptions, it was in Britain that Keltic survived, to be re-introduced, in the fifth and sixth centuries of our era, from Cornwall into the north-western corner of Gaul; and the Keltic dialects of Britain were never so much in danger of being supplanted by Latin as was Albanian, which almost became a Romance language, or as the Keltic dialects of Gaul, which actually were supplanted. Educated natives in Britain, who must have understood Latin in imperial times, were therefore bilingual, and some of the western dialects of the native speech of the

---

III 1937, 67-68. I find the statement of E. Zachrisson, "Romans, Kelts, and Saxons in Ancient Britain," *Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala*, XXIV 1927 (Festskrift tillägnad Uppsala Universitet) 25, far too sweeping.

<sup>41</sup> Writers who declare that no Keltic inscriptions have been found in Britain would do well to say what they mean by Britain (which for me includes Wales) and by Keltic (they seem to mean Brythonic). A declaration so incautiously worded is manifestly so false as not to need refutation. Granted that the inscriptions listed by Rhys in the Appendix to his *Lectures on Welsh Philology*, ed. 2, 1879, 357-407, are at most debased Latin, as well as late, and that the *ogam* inscriptions of Britain (*op. cit.*, 272-285; add the Silchester *ogam* discovered in 1893, see *Archaeologia*, second series, IV 1894, 233) are Goidelic and presumably the work of Irish immigrants, it is true only to say that Britain has no early Keltic inscriptions comparable to those of Gaul, and none at all that are Brythonic. At least the announcement made in the London *Times* 4 August 1930, p. 6, middle of column 7, of a "Brythonic" *graffito* discovered at Colchester in 1930 was, so far as I can find, premature. We are left, therefore, only with such indirect evidence as proper names in Latin inscriptions and the early history of the Welsh language and of Cornish and Breton furnish.

people, though much modified in form both during and just after the period of the Roman domination of Britain, so far from becoming extinct, still survive to this day as Welsh — but Welsh, in all its periods, has been written in the Latin alphabet.

The explanation is the same as in Gaul, that the great mass of the people could not write. Civilisation was backward, the population meagre and scattered, and illiteracy general and inevitable. The so-called Welsh “alphabet of Nemnivus,” which probably never was in use, is said to have been invented in answer to a Saxon’s taunt that the Britons had no letters, and it in fact is actually based on the Latin alphabet.<sup>42</sup> So the Saxon’s taunt was well founded.

Outside of Narbonensis, then, what Keltic inscriptions we have from Gaul are written in the Latin alphabet, and inside of it in the Greek alphabet, taken over from the Massiliots before the conquest of that province by the Romans and long before their conquest of the Tres Galliae. Three texts from Narbonensis which have been claimed as Keltic and not written in the Greek alphabet, from Marseilles, Vaison, and Annecy, are of doubtful kelticity. But even in Narbonensis the Greek alphabet which had thus been freely used for the writing of the native speech eventually gave way to the Latin script, especially after the Roman conquest, just as the language gave way to Latin speech, and finally Latin writing must have been used for all except inscriptions in the Greek language. This way of putting it admits the three dubious inscriptions; if they are excluded as being Latin in language as well as in alphabet, then we may say that Narbonensis has no Keltic inscriptions in anything but the Greek alphabet, and that this alphabet survived only for writing Greek: but Latin quickly won the mastery both in writing and in language after the conquest of Narbonensis by Rome.

The druids are said <sup>43</sup> to have used Greek writing for purposes other than their sacred lore, but if Caesar was able to use merely Greek letters (even, as is probable enough, also in cipher), and not the Greek language, as a means of disguising his communications with Quintus Cicero,<sup>44</sup> then it is evident that knowledge of them had not penetrated

<sup>42</sup> See J. Morris Jones, *Welsh Grammar*, 1913, 9.

<sup>43</sup> Caesar, *B.G.* VI 14.3; cf. Strabo IV 1.5, C 181, on the spread of Greek among the Gauls as the language of commerce (τὰ συμβόλαια Ἑλληνιστὶ γράφειν).

<sup>44</sup> *B.G.* V 48.4.



so far north as the country of the Nervii, whereas we have the direct testimony of Caesar himself that the Helvetii were familiar with the Greek alphabet.<sup>45</sup> It may be recalled, however, that Tacitus<sup>46</sup> reports the use of "Greek" writing by the Germans who lived on the Raetic frontier. This statement on the part of Tacitus is most plausibly interpreted to mean that some form of "Sub-Alpine" or "North Etruscan" alphabet had crossed the Alps (later to become the source of runic<sup>47</sup> letters), and it is possible that Caesar, or his informants, may have made the same mistake, in this matter of writing, about the Helvetii, as the informants of Tacitus did about the Germani. That explanation cannot be applied to Caesar's account of his own practice; nor is it likely to be right as regards the practice of the druids, for we actually have preserved Keltic inscriptions of Narbonensis written in the Greek alphabet, but it is by no means excluded in the case of the Helvetii. It has been held, for example by Rice Holmes,<sup>48</sup> that knowledge of writing was more general in Gaul in the middle of the last century B.C. than the evidence indicates. He calls attention to the remark of Diodorus<sup>49</sup> that the Gauls used to throw letters, addressed to the dead, on the funeral pile. But since such letters must have had a ritual value, it may be considered certain that they were written by the druids, and it by no means follows, as Rice Holmes assumed, on the ground of Diodorus' statement, that the knowledge of writing "was not confined to the priests." The main contention, however, that the art of writing was far from being general among the Keltic-speaking tribes prior to the Roman conquest is not seriously affected by these doubts, and the druids of Gaul, by countenancing writing at all,<sup>50</sup> were perhaps departing from the stricter druidical tradition of Britain. One

<sup>45</sup> *B.G.* I 29.1.

<sup>46</sup> *Germ.* 3.3; Solinus XX I, 100.3 M. asserts that Greek letters were used in a votive inscription in honor of Ulysses set up by the Caledones.

<sup>47</sup> See *PID* II 505 n. 1; *Foundations of Roman Italy* 188 n. 1; but the suggestion seems to have been made first by G. Hempl as long ago as 1899; see *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* II 370-374.

<sup>48</sup> *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul* ed. 2, 1911, 17; *The Roman Republic and the Founder of the Empire* II 1923, 6.

<sup>49</sup> V 28.6.

<sup>50</sup> We are not here concerned with druidical oral poetry, on which see C. Jullian, "De la littérature poétique des Gaulois," *RA*, 3e sér., XL 1902, 304-327; H. M. and N. K. Chadwick, *Growth of Literature*, I, Cambridge, 1932, 607-611.

of the chief contributions, then, of the process of romanization in the Tres Galliae, when at last it did come, was, as in Narbonensis, the Latin alphabet itself. It is unfortunate for us that this form of writing, once acquired, was so little used as it was for inscriptions in the Keltic dialects of Gaul.

### III. GAUL BEFORE THE ROMANS <sup>51</sup>

The infamous Glozel fraud <sup>52</sup> having gone the way of all frauds, the fantastic posers that were debated for some years after the "discovery" was first announced have vanished into limbo, whence there is no need to resurrect them. We start, therefore, with the coming of the Gauls, for Gaul was not the cradle of the Keltic peoples. Hecataeus of Miletus <sup>53</sup> was right when he counted the Phocaean colony of Massilia "a city in the land of the Ligurians" (πόλις τῆς Λιγυστικῆς) "below" or "adjoining the land of the Kelts" (κατὰ τὴν Κελτικὴν). For in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. the Kelts had not conquered, they

<sup>51</sup> See, inter alia, the articles *Frankreich*, *Französische Urbbevölkerung*, and *Kelten*, in Ebert's *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte* (O. Reche, H. Obermaier, P. Bosch Gimpera, J. de C. Serra Ràfols, E. Rademacher); and, above all, Déchelette and Grenier's *Mnl.* To these add L. Mirot, *Manuel de Géographie historique de la France*, Paris, 1929, chap. i, ii; C. Jullian, *De la Gaule à la France*, Paris, 1922, chap. iii, iv; A. Grenier, *Les Gaulois*, Paris, 1923; J. Loth, "La première apparition des Celtes dans l'île de Bretagne et en Gaule," *RC XXXVIII*, 1920-21, 259-288 (cf. *id.*, *REA XXIII*, 1921, 327-328; C. Jullian, *REA XXIV*, 1922, 160); O. Hirschfeld, "Timagenes und die gallische Wandersage," *Kleine Schriften*, Berlin, 1913, 1-18 (*SB der Berl. Akad.*, 12 April 1894, 331-347); H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, *Les Celtes*, Paris, 1904; J. Vendryes and H. Hubert, "Notes d'archéologie et de philologie celtiques," *RC XXXIV*, 1913, 1-13, 418-447; H. Hubert, "Bulletin des études archéologiques," *RC XLII*, 1925, 244-272; XLIV, 1927, 382-439; L. Joulin, "La protohistoire de la France du sud," *C. R. Acad. Insc. et Belles-Lettres*, 1922, 88-93, and *RA*, 5e sér., XVI 1922, 1-43; *id.*, "Les Celtes d'après les découvertes archéologiques récentes dans le sud de la France," *RA*, 5e sér., VIII, 1918, 74-109; Carl Schuchhardt, *Alteuropa*, ed. 3, Berlin and Leipzig, 1935.

<sup>52</sup> The articles of C. Jullian in *REA* make amusing reading: XXVIII 1926, 23, 361-362; XXIX 1927, 59; 157-186; 210; 259-299; 376-392; XXX 1928, 63-67; 107-114; 205-210; 211-214; 302-306; XXXI 1929, 37-41; 151-160; 230-235; 327-333. His attempts at interpretation are even more ridiculous (e.g. XXXI 40-41). A bibliography of "l'affaire Glozel" would fill pages, see *Mont.* IV Index, s.v. Glozel.

<sup>53</sup> Ap. Steph. Byz., s.v. *Μασσαλία* (F. Jacoby, *F. Gr. Hist.* 1, 1923, 1 fr. 55).



did not in fact conquer until about 300 B.C., south-eastern Gaul. So much is proved by archaeological evidence.<sup>54</sup> The region of the Pyrenees, however, they had reached much earlier, sometime in the fifth century; and it was about 400 B.C. that they crossed the Alps and burst into upper Italy.

In south-western Gaul, in the regions of Béarn, Gascony and western Languedoc, regions north of the Pyrenees from which Iberian coin legends are recorded, they found Iberians in occupation of the soil, and in south-eastern Gaul Ligurians, among whom, on the coast, Greek settlers had preceded them. North-eastern Gaul was subsequently occupied by Germans or mixed Kelts and Germans. Germanic tribes who are named on the west side of the Rhine are the Condrusi, Eburones, Caerosi, Paemani, Segni, Tungri, Sunuci, Baetasii, Vangiones, Nemetes, Triboci, and there were Germanic settlers among the Treueri. Even in imperial times there was at first a high proportion of Gauls enrolled in what were reckoned German legions, though as romanization advanced the Gauls showed less and less taste for military service. The ancients in fact found Kelts and Germans alike *μορφαῖς καὶ ἡθεσι καὶ βλοῖς*,<sup>55</sup> and to the inexpert they both sounded equally foreign in language, just as a man who knows only English will

<sup>54</sup> In addition to the results of modern archaeological research we have the testimony of ancient writers, especially Strabo IV; and Caesar *B.G.* passim. The attack made by Klotz on the authenticity of the geographical excursus in *B.G.* is generally discounted since the disproof of his contentions made by R. Koller. A popular account of the Kelts may be read in Edward Eyre, *European Civilisation*, I 1934, 220-225, 237 (on Keltic origins); II 1935, 163 (on the Kelts generally).

The work of W. H. Bullock Hall *The Romans on the Riviera and on the Rhone*, London 1898, besides being eminently readable, makes some points that are worth recalling here. He rightly stresses the importance of the *Ora Maritima* of Festus Avienus (fourth century of our era), since it was based upon the *periplus* which the Carthaginian navigator Himilco had compiled eight centuries before; hence the importance of the statement of Festus that the Rhone divided the Iberi and Ligyes (cf. Strabo III 4.19, C 166), and of assertions concerning incursions of Kelts into Gaul (Hall, 9, 10). Hall interprets (86) *Gallus* as meaning "living in Gaul" (not necessarily Keltic-speaking), pointing out that Provence was thus never occupied by Gauls, for it was not part of Gallia (53); with *Libica*, the name of the western mouth of the Rhone (Pl. III 5) he compares (48) the name of the *Libui*, a Ligurian tribe who lived near Verona (Livy V 35). The Belgae themselves, he reminds us (5, n. 1), had come from across the Rhine and expelled "Galli" (Caesar, *B.G.* II 3).

<sup>55</sup> Strabo VII 1.2, C 290. Cf. A. Helbok, *Grundlagen der Volksgeschichte Deutsch-*

hear Italian and Spanish as foreign and yet somehow alike. Not only fundamental agreements,<sup>56</sup> but borrowings, back and forth, made for some superficial points of agreement between Germanic and Keltic especially in frontier regions, and even modern criticism, which usually can distinguish, no matter which of the two ascriptions ancient writers may give, is occasionally at a loss and unable to determine definitely between them. A typical situation that may have given rise to such a linguistic confusion is, for example, created by a migration such as that of the Germanic Sugambri to the left bank of the Rhine, which took place in 8 B.C.;<sup>57</sup> for confusion of the same order does actually extend itself also to material remains. Thus a fortress at Allenbach<sup>58</sup> shows defenses which, it is claimed, may be interpreted either as early "Keltic" defenses against the Germans, or as late "Keltic" against the Romans!

There are, therefore, at least all these five linguistic elements (Ligurian, Iberian, Greek, Germanic, Keltic) to be distinguished in pre-Roman Gaul, the Keltic being by far the most conspicuous and most important, and the territorial limits of the other four being in general well known, even if their precise boundaries are not. Thus it was in the Rhineland that the population was German or strongly germanized, but in close contact with "Keltic" influences and "Keltic" civilization; and Keltic peoples had preceded the Germans there. After the conquest by Caesar, however, even on the Rhine there was no further "Keltic" expansion, but rather a fusion of Kelts and Germans, with romanizing tendencies, and in imperial times articles of trade in that region are definitely provincial Roman in character. The Ligurians stretched as far north as the Isère, and the boundary between the Iberians, or rather the Aquitani, and the Gauls is stated by Caesar himself to have been the river Garonne. So we have the Aquitani of

*lands und Frankreichs*, Berlin, 1937, 74-237; with Atlas of maps (1938), especially nos. 80, 117-119.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. p. 19 above. Matteo Bartoli has called attention to some agreements between Keltic and Germanic that are not merely lexical in *Neophilologus*, XXIV 1939, 140 nn. 5, 6 (where he gives references to some relevant, and some quite irrelevant, discussion in *Festschrift für Herman Hirt*, q.v.).

<sup>57</sup> Fortifications belonging to this period were reported in *Germania*, XX 1936, 173-183.

<sup>58</sup> *Loc. cit.* 93-100. I do not defend this use of "Keltic."

Caesar's grouping between the Garonne and the Pyrenees, largely Iberian in their make-up, and therefore akin to the people of Spain; the Belgae, mixed Keltic and Germanic, to the north-east of the Seine and the Marne, in the plains of Picardy, Artois, and Champagne, along the Scheldt, lower Rhine, and in the Ardennes; and the Celtae proper occupying the lowlands of Switzerland, Alsace, Lorraine, part of the Rhenish provinces, and the great plains and uplands of central France as far as the Atlantic seaboard; while a large part of Provence, from the Alps and the Isère, at least as far west as the river Rhone, was occupied by Ligurians, who also stretched east and south into Italy, and who, whatever view be taken of their ethnic and linguistic connexions, were certainly on the soil long before the Kelts.

The current view held by competent archaeologists<sup>59</sup> is that the early home of the Kelts was to the east of the Rhine, perhaps stretching as far as Bohemia. The Bavarian barrow-builders have been claimed by one authority<sup>60</sup> as "proto-Kelts." Attention is called to the frequent occurrence of old Keltic names of mountains, rivers, and forests between the basins of the upper Danube and Rhine, and this area is accordingly claimed as the "Keltic" cradle, appeal being made for confirmation to a druidic tradition preserved in a fragment of Timagenes as recorded by Ammianus Marcellinus;<sup>61</sup> in contrast the ancient name of a settlement *Liguria*, in modern form Livièrre, near Narbonne according to Gregory of Tours,<sup>62</sup> is thought to chime with the assertion of Hecataeus<sup>63</sup> that the Ἑλσυκοί were Ligurians.<sup>64</sup> At-

<sup>59</sup> See, for example, C. F. C. Hawkes, *Prehistoric Foundations of Europe*, 1940, 370: the home of the Kelts was in S. W. Germany, with the Swiss plateau and eastern France, extending to the east more than to the west of the Rhine, and including N. W. Germany. He, however, also appeals to linguistic evidence — namely, river-names.

<sup>60</sup> V. G. Childe, *Proceedings of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, 1926, Section H, 392. Cf. G. Sergi, *Italia: le origini* (Turin, 1919) 154, 322, 409; J. Pokorny, *ZfCPH*, XX 1933-36, 518. But see my criticism, *Foundations of Roman Italy*, 1937, 107.

<sup>61</sup> XV 9.2-4 (F. Jacoby, *F. Gr. Hist.* 2 A, 1926, 88 fr. 2).

<sup>62</sup> *Miraculorum Lib. I de gloria martyrum*, 92 (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* LXXI col. 786), cf. *REA* VII, 1905, 389 n. 1; VIII, 1906, 250-251.

<sup>63</sup> Ap. Steph. Byz., s.v. Ἑλσυκοί (F. Jacoby, *F. Gr. Hist.* 1, 1923, 1 fr. 53).

<sup>64</sup> J. M. de Navarro, *Proceedings of the First International Congress of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences*, 1932 [1934], Oxford and London, 277-278.



tempts to apply linguistic evidence to the problem of "Keltic" origins and relationships are confusing. A. Meillet, for example, would cut the Gordian knot of agreements not merely between Keltic, Italic, Slavonic, and Germanic<sup>65</sup> but also of Keltic etc. with Greek and Hittite by ascribing them all quite simply to conservatism, and made no attempt to approach the question where Keltic or any other of these languages evolved. Similarly, S. Feist,<sup>66</sup> dealing with identical evidence, left open the question precisely where on the right bank of the Rhine was the original home of the Kelts — possibly, he granted, while admitting no proof, in the Danube valley. Julius Pokorny has now worked out his theories<sup>67</sup> in much greater detail, since he stated them in 1928 and 1933.<sup>68</sup> He thinks of a western group of Indo-European-speaking people as splitting into Germanic and Italo-Keltic groups. To the north of a line running from Bremen through Magdeburg and Eberswalde to Stettin were the "Nordic" tribes; between this line and the Alps is a territory bisected by a line Saale-Chemnitz-Enns to the east of which the archaeologists find the Lausitz-culture characterised by urnfields, and to the west the people who from their type of graves are called the tumulus-builders. Now according to Pokorny the Lausitz-people spoke Illyrian, and from the tumulus-builders sprang both the Italici and the Kelts. After the Italici had moved off into Italy, there were left behind "Kelto-Italici" whom he regards as proto-Kelts, whence arose (c. 1200 B.C.) the true Kelts of history in the course of a great expansion which upset all the peoples of central Europe. These true Kelts were evolved from the admixture

<sup>65</sup> *Actes du deuxième Congrès international de Linguistes*, 1931 [1933], 203.

<sup>66</sup> *Op. cit.* 186.

<sup>67</sup> "Zur Urgeschichte der Kelten und Illyrier (mit einem Beitrage von R. Pitioni)," Halle, 1939, reprinted from *ZfCPH* XX 2 (1935), 315-352; XX 3 (1936), 489-522; XXI 1 (1938), 55-204. But see the reviews, mostly unfavorable: KHM in *Rocznik Slawistyczny*, XIII 1937, 134; M.-L. Sjaestedt-Jonval, *Bull. de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, XL 1939, 105-111; K. H. Jackson, *Antiquity*, XV 1941, 96-100; V. G. Childe, *ibid.*, 100-102; M. Lejeune, *REA* XLI, 1939, 93-95.

Cf. Hawkes *op. cit.* (n. 59 above), 363-364.

<sup>68</sup> *Actes du premier Congrès international de Linguistes*, 1928, 175-176; *A. du troisième Congr. internat. de Linguistes*, 1933 [1935], 82-86 (cf. J. Vendryes in *Études celtiques*, II 1937, 185-186); *Nature*, CXXXII 1933, 648 (cf. *Proceedings of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, 1933, 517-518).

of Lausitz-people, some of whom had moved westwards to conquer and settle among the tumulus-builders, pushing as far as Belgium and central France, while others went southwards to Hungary and over the eastern Alps into Italy to become respectively the Illyrians and Veneti of history. This reconstruction of the prehistoric situation is supported by strong archaeological evidence, and from the linguistic side Pokorny attempts to bring the testimony of ancient local names into accord with it. His efforts are not completely successful, however, for they require us to see Illyrian names extended over an area so wide that for Pokorny Illyrian would seem to cover a multitude of Indo-European dialects; and they overlook completely the strong Italic flavor of Venetic. He has performed a valuable service by selecting and re-arranging some of the evidence to be had from nomenclature, and he has called attention to a number of linguistic features which appear to link Keltic and Illyrian closely together. But the interpretation of ancient names is usually a matter of questionable etymology, and their evidence often open to more than one seemingly defensible reading. As for agreements between Illyrian and Keltic, they are not notably more marked than such coincidences between any two Indo-European dialects; where they are not due to conservatism they may be as much the result of independent development as of a common origin. In particular, as Kuryłowicz pointed out in 1933 during the discussion of Pokorny's paper read to the Third Congress of Linguists, the development of  $r$  to  $ri$  and of  $l$  to  $li$  in Keltic is comparatively late, and therefore to be dissociated from the same development in Illyrian. And in general, the theory<sup>69</sup> which Pokorny

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Max Vasmer "Beiträge zur alten Geographie der Gebiete zwischen Elbe und Weichsel," *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie*, V 1928-29, 360-370; *id.*, "Beiträge zur slavischen Altertumskunde: i. Nochmals die Nordillyrier," *ibid.*, VI 1929-30, 145-151; *id.*, "Beiträge etc.: vi. Neues und Nachträgliches," *ibid.*, VIII 1931, 113-119. Without returning to the explanation of Al. Schachmatov, "Zu den ältesten slavisch-keltischen Beziehungen," *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, XXXIII 1912, 51-99, which tended to see the Slavs as Kelts, we may readily admit an I. Eu. linguistic stratum as a common source of much that Keltic, Germanic, Slavic, Italic, and Illyrian hold in common, and that is doubtless the best view to take of agreements in toponymy between Keltic and west Slavonic areas; see Lubor Niederle, *Manuel de l'antiquité slave* I, 1923, 25-26 (cf. *REA*, XXVI 1924, 145). At all events Pokorny's use of historical labels to designate prehistoric cultures is completely unjustified.



has followed and elaborated deprives Illyrian of all geographical, and of almost the whole of its linguistic, meaning — everything from Poland to Spain and from the Baltic to the Mediterranean becomes grist to his Illyrian mill.

The facts, then, do not warrant a more precise statement than the one given above (p. 37) that the early home of the Kelts was to the east of the Rhine. This view has some positive support from scattered notices in ancient writers, as we have seen, and also the negative support of language, in so far as the fact that the river-names of Gaul, which in general may be supposed to be older than the names of towns, are not as a rule Keltic, whereas the latter are, may be taken to show that in the local names of Gaul there is a stratum which was laid down, so to speak, by a people or peoples who preceded the Keltic-speaking tribes there.<sup>70</sup> Thus, even so Keltic-seeming a mountain-name and river-name as *Ceuenna*, *Cebenna* (the Cévennes) is probably pre-Keltic; for it appears to show a Gaulish sound-change (lenited *m*)<sup>71</sup> as compared with Ligurian *Cemenelon* (Cimiez), and in fact, in Greek sources it is written Κέμμενον. Ultimately the centre of distribution of the Keltic languages must be the same as that of all the other Indo-European languages, which in no event can be placed in Gaul.

Since there is independent testimony that the Belgae arose from the fusion of the remnants of a Keltic population settled to the west of the lower Rhine with Germanic invaders, it would be an obvious assumption that their speech, so far as it remained Keltic, must have shown marked dialectal differences as compared with that of the Celtae or Gauls, precisely as Caesar avers to have been the fact. Moreover, since Iberian is admittedly not an Indo-European language at all, it is evident that, so far as Iberian still survived at that time, or its influence, Caesar or his source must have been rightly informed that the language of the Aquitani was also different from that of the Celtae. Again, those who hold that Ligurian was not Indo-European, must

<sup>70</sup> On the "pre-Keltic" and "pre-Italic" substratum see the papers of Bertoldi summarized in *REA*, XXXII 1930, 305-308; cf. *id.*, "Problèmes du substrat: Essai de méthodologie dans le domaine préhistorique de la toponymie et du vocabulaire," *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, XXXII, 1931, 93-184.

<sup>71</sup> Pedersen, *VKG*, 165; the ancient sources for the forms quoted are given in *AcS*, s.v.

take the same view of the language of the greater part of Narbonensis, if not in Caesar's day, then a century earlier or more; and those who regard Ligurian as having been Indo-European still are agreed in distinguishing it from Keltic. Whether or not the non-Latin and non-Greek inscriptions of Narbonensis, however, are Ligurian is another question; even if they are counted Keltic, it still remains to ask how far, if at all, they differ from the other Keltic inscriptions of Gaul. If they are Ligurian, then, first, Ligurian certainly was Indo-European but not Illyrian; and, second, a question of the relation between Ligurian and Lepontic in Cisalpine Gaul is raised, since Lepontic is not Keltic but Ligurian or rather Kelto-Ligurian.

The diffusion of the Keltic languages is plausibly associated with a series of migrations that took place in the first half of the last millennium B.C. from a region that corresponds roughly with what is now north-western Germany. The causes of these migrations are supposed to have been the pressure of alien peoples, the stress of climate that produced it, and perhaps the growth of population and love of plunder. However that may be, there were movements into Britain; and also, more important for us, a large-scale migration, thought to have taken place in the latter part of the sixth century, in a south-westerly direction across France towards the Pyrenees. Some detachments of the people who thus migrated even reached Spain, but the great mass of them seem to have settled in new homes in central and western Gaul.<sup>72</sup>

<sup>72</sup> Cf. A. Grenier, *La Gaule romaine* (pp. 379-644 of T. Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* III 1937), 396-417; Eoin MacNeill, *Phases of Irish History*, 1919, 11-30; Hans Philipp, *Vor- und Frühgeschichte des Mittelmeerraumes*, 1937, 94-98 and 248-255; Auguste Vincent, *Toponymie de la France*, 1939, §§ 173-202; P. Bosch Gimpera, "Two Celtic Waves in Spain," *Proceedings of the British Academy*, XXVI 1940, 25-148 (really an archaeologist's survey of the "Keltic" problem, according to modern theory).

A summary statement may be useful:

c. 1000 B.C.: Formation and expansion of the Kelts.

Between c. 950 and 500: Hallstatt; Kelts move as far as central France.

c. 450: A second expansion (La Tène).

c. 450-300: Kelts dominant in Gaul.

c. 300: Kelts from the right bank of the Rhine move west (Belgica) and also much later into Britain from Belgica; last of all the Treueri, followed by the Germanic tribes (Nemetes, Vangiones etc.) across the Rhine.

113-102 B.C.: Cimbri and Teutones.

In Gaul the beginning of the Iron Age, that revolution in civilization which is supposed to have had its centre at Hallstatt, is placed about 800 B.C. The expansion of the Kelts falls within the following two centuries, marked by the movement of warlike migratory bands, builders of tumuli, from southern Bavaria along the Rhine and Moselle, and thence via river-valleys into the heart of Gaul. The form of burial of the chieftain with his warriors around him, all of them equipped with weapons and accoutrements, is held to prove a feudal organization; just as in the fifth century B.C. in Champagne tombs containing chariots and harness mark another stage in the development of this conquering aristocracy who settled on the soil of France, subjecting and uniting with the previous population, imposing its language, its ethnic names, and its social organisation upon them. It has been conjectured, not very convincingly however, that the ancient territorial divisions corresponding to more than sixty peoples, which we find in Gaul in Roman times, may go back even to the pre-Keltic period. But the names of the huge terrains into which Gaul came to be divided are usually derivatives of personal names, and mainly Keltic. By the fifth century the country had become rich and overpopulated, and the Bituriges, with their centralised political organisation aimed under their chieftain Ambigatus to secure a hegemony over the other Gauls.<sup>73</sup> This was about 400 B.C. The policies of Ambigatus, as described by Livy, are perhaps to be associated with the diffusion of the La Tène civilisation, which followed closely the direction of the Rhine and the Danube. But *Celtica* properly so called was the territory between the rivers Seine and Garonne, and by the fourth century its frontiers and tribal boundaries, under the regime of an aristocratic oligarchy that was replacing the older system of royalty, were probably established very much as we find them in Roman times. Not later than the beginning of the third century a new Keltic expansion occurred in several parts of Europe, bringing the La Tène period I to its close. This was the period of the Belgic invasions, and by the end of the century the Belgae had occupied the territory north of the Seine and Marne, where Caesar found them. From what is conjectured of their historical evolution it would be natural for them to have a dialect different from the Celtae, much as the details of the differences may escape us. During

<sup>73</sup> Livy, V 34.1.



this La Tène period II hegemony over the Celtae passed into the hands of the Arverni, the last two leaders of whom were Luerius (or Luer-nius), a contemporary of Aemilius Paulus, and his son and successor Bituitus, whom the Romans captured in 121 B.C.

La Tène I and II were periods of considerable luxury and magnificence. The following period, La Tène III, is much poorer and marked a regression, at least on the continent. It was, in fact, opened by a catastrophe, such as more recent events can parallel, the invasion of Gaul by the Cimbri and Teutones. The hegemony of the Arverni was broken by the Romans, and among the Gauls themselves were division and dissension. It was, nevertheless, old memories of the Arverni that, about a century later, inspired the exploits of Vercingetorix.<sup>74</sup> Romans and Gauls alike in Provence were overwhelmed by the Cimbri and Teutones, and Gaul had scarcely had time to repair its ruins after their onslaught before Caesar appeared on the scene in 58 B.C. But the rivalries of the Aedui and Sequani, together with the threat to Gaul from the Suebi and others led by Ariovistus, the overflowing of the Kelts of the Danube valley and from the right bank of the Rhine, particularly in the southern part of its upper course, between the Alps and the Jura mountains — the country of the Helvetii —, compelled rather than invited the intervention of Caesar in the affairs of Gaul proper that, in the end, led to the subjugation of the entire land to the Romans. The final period, therefore, La Tène III, preceding the Gallo-Roman period, was by comparison with those that had gone before, one of poverty and collapse.

That a people entered Gaul, coming from the lower Rhine, is held to be proved by the similarities which have been observed, for example, in the structure of their graves and in much of the pottery which they made. The migration into north-eastern France (the Belgae) took place, as we have seen, somewhat later, in the course, perhaps, of the fourth century B.C.,<sup>75</sup> and, as is well known, there were other movements further south, into Italy, and also to the south-east, into the Danubian regions, the Balkan peninsula, and even Asia Minor. The Germanic tribes, whose expansion is thought to have been one of the

<sup>74</sup> *B.G.* VII 4.1.

<sup>75</sup> Opinion on the date varies; some archaeologists say c. 500, others not later than the beginning of the third century B.C.

causes of these migrations, bordered the Keltic peoples on the east, and there must have been some intermixture of the two groups, notably along the valley of the Rhine, where, as we have seen, the Belgae of history may be supposed to have been descended from the older Keltic and later Germanic invaders. Finally, Belgae themselves moved to Britain in large numbers between about 100 and 60 B.C. Meanwhile, not only did the Kelts advance towards developing something like an urban life of their own, and so prepare the way themselves for a more rapid romanization, but, in the course of the second century B.C., Roman interests had actually begun to be established in southern Gaul, at least in Narbonensis, on what was destined to be an enduring basis.

Evidently, then, the native material civilization of the Gauls was entering upon its final stages of the La Tène culture in the second century B.C., and had reached its end by the end of the last century B.C. What with the Roman conquest and annexation of Provence, and the advance of Germanic tribes from beyond the Rhine, the Gauls were already being placed on the defensive by the middle of this period.

It is probably the mere lack of evidence that gives us the impression that pre-Roman and Keltic Gaul endured the period of romanization in religion and in political organization far more successfully than in language, at least superficially. Though the worship of Roman deities was introduced, under Latin names, still the native names survived in many localities, either alone, or, by the easy process of syncretism, identified with the Latin names. Or where we have actually only Latin names, the underlying concept was usually native, even where it is a concept that is found also in Roman or Greek religion — in fact the “*interpretatio Graeca*” often preceded the “*interpretatio Romana*” so far as Keltic religion and its native survivals are affected. Thus we have, for example, Teutates, Esus, and Taranis (identified respectively with Mercury, Mars, and Jupiter), Maponus, Grannus, and Belenus (all three identified with Apollo), Taruos Trigaranus “the bull with the three cranes,” Boruo or Bormo<sup>76</sup> (the god of warm springs), Mercurius Dumias (a local god, at Puy de Dôme), Magusanus and Deusoniensis (Hercules), Ogmios (the god alleged to have presided over eloquence and the power of speech), Cernunnus (thought

<sup>76</sup> The relation between these two forms seems to be the same as that between *Ceuenna* and *Cemenelon*, cf. p. 40, n. 71 above.



to have been a chthonic deity), Epona (the goddess of horses and horsemen, whose name was left undisturbed), Iouantucarus (Mercury), Cobledulitanus (Apollo), Sucellus, Segomo (Mars), Camulus (Mars), Clauariates (Mercury),<sup>77</sup> the *deae Matres* (*Matrae*, *Matronae* — spirits of the springs, rivers, forests, or mountains, guardians of the land and its inhabitants) who are often further found designated and localized by the addition of a local epithet. Again we find Mercury associated with Rosmerta (*f.*), and Apollo with Sirona (*f.*). To the druids, a sacerdotal caste, passing reference will suffice. As for the Jupiter-columns, as they are called, these are partly non-Keltic as well as non-Roman. But the *Campestres*, *Suleviae* or *Triuiae*, or *Fatae* (to give them their Roman name), a trinity of goddesses, were as native as the “*genius cucullatus*.” Of the Roman gods, Hercules perhaps enjoyed the greatest popularity.

Although, therefore, as a matter of policy, the cult of the emperor was introduced quite early (Drusus established an altar to “Rome and Augustus” in 12 B.C. at Lyons,<sup>78</sup> where the cult was administered by the *concilium Galliarum*) and druidism repeatedly suppressed (first by Tiberius in A.D. 16),<sup>79</sup> still, so long as paganism lasted, the spirit of druidism in Gaul evidently remained Keltic at least as much as it became Roman or Italian. In that sense, therefore, the advent of Christianity, as it brought about the gradual disappearance of paganism, marched with the advance of the Latin language; for example, ancient secret charms and remedies which the old faith had prescribed appear couched in what passed for the old language, even if sadly corrupt in form. But there can be no doubt that the diffusion of Latin was completed by Christian preaching; at the end of the empire, it was the only language of Gaul. And the situation is in some ways analogous to what we find in nomenclature. “The reproduction of the Gallic proper names in Latin, not seldom with the retention of non-Latin forms in sound,” was natural enough, for Latin names were not

<sup>77</sup> For some of these see, e.g., Dessau, *Insc. Lat. Sel.*, 4538, 4500, 4599, 4601, 4638; but full references to *CIL* will be given in the appropriate places in the main body of the work.

<sup>78</sup> Dio Cassius, LIV 32.1; cf. Dessau 112 (Narbo, *numini Augusti*), *CIL* XIII ii 2, p. 505 (ara Vbiorum, at Cologne, 9 B.C.–A.D. 4).

<sup>79</sup> Cf. *Cambridge Ancient History*, X 645, n. 1.

adopted wholesale, especially for names of places, any more than English or other European names have totally displaced Indian names in North America; nor were the Roman or Italian personal names which veterans, settlers, and merchants brought with them universally acceptable to Gauls. But we are not entitled to conclude on this ground, as Mommsen did, that "the vigorous survival of the national language is most distinctly shown" <sup>80</sup> by the survival of Keltic proper names, or that Keltic religion "vanished even more rapidly" than the language.<sup>81</sup>

As with religion, language, and nomenclature, so it was in matters of political organization. Yet there is a difference. The framework of the native cantonal organization was respected by the Roman imperial administration, but for all official purposes Latin was required almost from the beginning. Gallic coins under Roman rule follow Latin types, and we have virtually no public document in any Keltic dialect of Gaul. The one notable exception, the famous calendar of Coligny, is more apparent than real; for it is at least as much a religious as a political document, and it was deliberately smashed into fragments in ancient times. The large three-fold subdivision of the three Gauls, then, the *Belgae*, *Celtae*, and *Aquitani*, rested on a corresponding grouping of tribes (*ciuitates*); and each tribe was made up of an aggregate of communities, called *pagi* in Latin, whose relationship to one another might be based on nothing more than that of neighborhood, though usually it implied blood-kinship, real or assumed. A very small tribe might, indeed, consist of a single *pagus*, with its own presiding magistrate, and even among the united *pagi*, each community, before the coming of the Romans, had retained some degree of independence. The larger unions were characteristic especially of central Gaul, but among the *Aquitani* the smaller units persisted. Again, smaller unions sometimes appear as bound by *clientela* to a larger or central *ciuitas*. Thus the *Segusiani*, *Ambrualeti*, *Aulerci Brannouices* ("raven-warriors"), and *Brannouii* are named by Caesar<sup>82</sup>

<sup>80</sup> *Provinces of the Roman Empire*, I 100.

<sup>81</sup> *Op. cit.* 106. Contrast Mommsen's own statements elsewhere about the suppression of Keltic (82, 99, 100), or the survival of non-Roman worship (103), where he seems to contradict himself.

<sup>82</sup> *B.G.* VII 75. For names of the type of *Brannouices* cf. *Eburones* "people of the yew." But *Brannouii* is probably mere dittography.

as client-unions of the Aedui, smaller, that is, than appear among the cantons as re-organized by Augustus.<sup>83</sup> The native title of the chief magistrate, at least among the Aedui, has been preserved to us, namely *uergobretus*,<sup>84</sup> and neither title nor office appears to have become extinct in early imperial times. We have some hints, too, of social organization in the native words for "servant" and "serf," viz. *\*uassalus* and *ambactus*; large numbers of these, and clients also, were bound to each member of the nobility, whom Caesar designated as *equites*. And the much later survival of native road-measurements is implied in the official recognition by Severus, early in the third century after Christ, of the Keltic unit of length, the league (French *lieue*), *leuga*, which was about one and a half Roman miles.

From the historical evidence, then, taken alone, it would appear that the Belgic Kelts were the latest comers into pre-Roman Gaul, and, if Caesar was rightly informed, that the languages of the Belgae and of the Celtae were, or had been, distinct. Both, however, were presumably Keltic, and therefore the differences may not have been very great. Again, the conquering Kelts, as the evidence of nomenclature shows, had advanced, probably in not very large numbers, beyond the Garonne: it is not astonishing that *Gallus* acquired the meanings of "stranger" and "enemy." But without careful analysis the evidence of nomenclature may easily be deceptive. Recent studies of personal names among the Treueri, for example, reveal a smaller proportion of Keltic and Germanic names than might have been expected from a cursory survey of the evidence. And even when accurately determined, percentages of relative frequency of occurrence of names of given origin are not to be taken merely at their face value. Nevertheless, it seems improbable that the Keltic language ever was generally spoken in Aquitania, but Iberian instead; and altogether probable that, both among the Belgae and among the Celtae, the conquerors had imposed their own language upon the conquered peoples. Further, if, in Caesar's day, some knowledge of Latin had penetrated even to the Belgae, as Caesar's own precautions against knowledge of his plans reaching the enemy, in case his communications to his legates should fall into their hands, imply,<sup>85</sup> yet it is also true that at the be-

<sup>83</sup> Mommsen, *op. cit.*, I 95, n. 2.

<sup>84</sup> *B.G.*, I 16.5; see *AcS* III 213-214 for some variant forms or spellings.

<sup>85</sup> *B.G.*, V 48.4, cf. p. 32 above.



ginning of his campaigns he had to converse through an interpreter with Diviciacus, who either could not or would not talk Latin (or Greek).<sup>86</sup> For in Provence the language of Rome had begun to take root even before Caesar's arrival.

Most attempts to give substance to Caesar's assertion about differences in language between the Belgae, the Aquitani, and the Celtae, apart from the obvious explanation that covers the Iberian Aquitani and the partly Germanic Belgae, can hardly be regarded as more than mere conjecture. This conclusion is true notably of well-nigh everything that Sir John Rhys wrote on the subject.<sup>87</sup> But Caesar, as we have seen, was not alone in what he said, for Strabo had made the remark that the inhabitants of Gaul, though the appearance and material civilization of all were identical or similar, did not all speak the same language. Unfortunately Strabo, like Caesar, gives us no detailed information, and his remark, which stems from the same source as Caesar's, may refer to nothing more than the obvious distinctions between Provence and Aquitania and the rest of Gaul.<sup>88</sup> In that case, nothing more recondite is meant than Keltic as contrasted with Iberian and Ligurian and Germanic — or various degrees of intermixture of some of these (as Iberian and Keltic, Germanic and Keltic, or Ligurian and Keltic or Iberian and Ligurian), at least in frontier-districts.

Linguists have usually ignored the problem, not altogether without reason. Those of them who have discussed it at all have, without exception, committed themselves to some particular theory, however wild, and have supported that theory through thick and thin, on the slenderest evidence, or no evidence at all. One of the least prejudiced accounts that I have read, and one in which the author tried to give a survey of conflicting opinions, without trying to reconcile contradictions, was not written by a linguist at all, but by a schoolmaster-

<sup>86</sup> *B.G.*, I 19.3.

<sup>87</sup> Compare also the note by Rice Holmes in his edition of Caesar's *de Bello Gallico* I, 1914, 37, where, after pointing out that "Most of the Celtae spoke Gaulish or Gallo-Brythonic," and that the language of the Belgae presumably must have been, in the main, the same tongue, he continues "Perhaps . . . some spoke a different Celtic dialect; . . . for at a later period inscriptions were erected in Gaul in a language which was different from Gaulish," and then adds that this other language may already have been a dead language!

<sup>88</sup> So *Do.* 26-27.

historian. In 1911 the late T. E. Rice Holmes, in the second edition of his *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*, gave a résumé<sup>89</sup> of the theories then current on the subject of the dialects of Gaul which showed all his usual shrewdness and common sense. After calling attention to the possibility that traces of *q*-Keltic may lurk hidden in the magico-medical formularies of Marcellus of Bordeaux (which some scholars "do not take seriously") or in local names like *Sequana*, *Sequani* (which some hold are "not Keltic" — and to which he might have added the divine name *Sinquatis*), Rice Holmes, following Rhys and Nicholson in their studies of the calendar of Coligny, accepted them as tending to show that Goidelic as well as Brythonic Keltic was at some time spoken in Gaul. The view of d'Arbois de Jubainville that the Coligny calendar is written in Ligurian he dismisses. And he concludes that the Belgae and Celtae spoke one and the "same [Keltic] language or dialects of it." This language, moreover, was not a language that could have been spoken in Gaul before the arrival, in the first half of the last millennium B.C., of the invading peoples from the east of the Rhine, but was one which they had brought with them; for, where even some of the local names, as well as most of the personal names are Keltic, including those of the nobility, "is it credible that the chiefs of the conquering race should have been called by names that were not their own but those of their subjects?"

But for the student of language the best and, I think, the most recent, account of the problem and of the present state of knowledge is unquestionably that by L. Weisgerber, *Die Sprache der Festlandkelten*, published in 1931.<sup>90</sup> Weisgerber rightly maintains that many of the variations which we find in our written records must reflect actual differences within the dialects of continental Keltic: "dass das weite Keltengebiet eine völlig einheitliche Sprache aufgewiesen habe, ist trotz der auffälligen — nur der Gleichförmigkeit auch in der materiellen Hinterlassenschaft der Latènezeit vergleichbaren — Gleichheit der Ortsnamen nicht anzunehmen." But he will have none of Nicholson's conjectures concerning the preservation of initial *p* in "Sequanian," "Continental Pictish," and in the Keltic of north Italy, nor of Feist's theories about "Kelto-Germans" (which boil down "in gewöhnlichen

<sup>89</sup> 318-321, 329.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. p. 7 above; see especially *SprFK* 183-188.



Wörtern" to the simple statement "sie sind sprachlich zweifellos Germanen"). And he is highly sceptical, and rightly, of any assumption of dialectal differences which rests upon, or is made to bolster up, some isolated etymology. As for the statement in Caesar, echoed in Strabo, "gerade hier ist es nicht möglich, auf Grund unserer Kenntnis des Gallischen einen Dialektgegensatz festzustellen." But, in this connexion, it must be pointed out that Weisgerber's own discussion of the problems raised by certain forms presented in the calendar of Coligny (*equos*, *prin(n)i*, *petiux*), and of numerous other alleged instances of dialectal variations (e.g. *-cenna*: *pennos*, *εἰωπον*: *ieuru*), is quite inconclusive; although, by its very admission of such variations, it is also inconsistent with his own opinion as just quoted.

Weisgerber stresses "Substratforschung." This emphasis upon substratum is important enough, if it is limited to the time when the new language (namely Latin) was being learnt, but not if it is extended to show Gallic influence in later Romance developments. The atavistic interpretation of the substratum-theory is pure fancy;<sup>91</sup> and it is most actively plied where the substratum is well-nigh unknown. Then too Weisgerber stresses the modern method of dialect-geography, which also has its dangers if interpreted, as it were, once (and even more than once) removed: "namentlich die Romanistik arbeitet in weitem Umfang mit der Annahme mundartlicher Entwicklungen im Gallischen." The danger here is the obvious one that what is merely hypothesis for Romance linguistics is apt to be taken as fact for Keltic. However, it is possible to show that some fairly trustworthy conclusions have been reached: "danach ist man berechtigt, eine gallische dialektische Entwicklung anzunehmen, wenn bei unzweifelhaft gallischen Namen oder Wörtern in den romanischen Deszendenten Lautwandel eingetreten ist, der den romanischen Mundarten in der Verbreitzungszone des gallischen Wortes fremd ist." Thus the change of *st* to *p*, or of *nn* to *nd*, or a variation in writing (and pronunciation) such as *rc*: *rg* (*arcanto*:- *arganto*-, *uerco*:- *uergo*-) can be shown to be essentially dialectal. Another example of some interest is the change of *u*- to *f*- (regular in Goidelic, cf. Eng. *flannel* but W. *gwlan*), which

<sup>91</sup> Cf. *Cinquième Congrès International de Linguistes: Réponses au Questionnaire*, Bruges, 1939, 48.

is attested by French *flanelle*,<sup>92</sup> or Fr. *faner* (cf. Gael. *fann*), Fr. *fêlon* (Gael. *feall*), so that apparently the Irish change ("seit dem 6. Jahrhundert bezeugt") "mundartlich auch im Gallischen gelebt hat," though there is no clear, undisputed case of initial *f*- to be found in extant Gaulish records. But, as Weisgerber himself points out, much still remains to be done in the work of collecting relevant evidence, especially from the development of local names, before definite boundaries can be drawn; and his final remarks are worth quoting:

Von Seiten der Keltologie selbst wäre besonders eine Verarbeitung der altkeltischen Sprachreste nach einzelnen Landschaften bzw. Stammesgebieten nötig, um überhaupt Anhaltspunkte für die Feststellung der Besonderheiten einzelner Gebiete zu liefern. Aber selbst die Zusammenstellungen der inschriftlichen Funde aus bestimmten Bezirken . . . widmen diesen Fragen wenig Beachtung . . . ; so kommen Versuche in dieser Richtung . . . noch nicht über erste Ansätze hinaus.

The cantonal organization of the Gauls would naturally lead to the development of dialectal variations among them. Much has been made by all writers on this subject of the form *equos* in the Coligny calendar. But we should remember that Umbrian has *ekvine* (cf. Sabine *tescua*), despite its treatment of I. Eu. *qu* as *p*. The best solution of this problem would seem to be that *qu* and *ku* were distinguished;<sup>93</sup> possibly the same solution is to be applied also to the local names that derive from *\*Aequoranda*.<sup>94</sup> But if *Sequana* does contain not *ku* but *qu*, then there is clearly a difference of sound-change in Gaulish *petru*- "four," though the Germanic *f*- (Goth. *fidwor*) is worth consideration in this connexion. Again, the pronunciation *i*, as contrasted with Latin *e*, attested by Consentius,<sup>95</sup> would appear to be Keltic and perhaps dialectal. Dottin<sup>96</sup> calls attention to *\*bruca*, implied by Fr. *bruyère*, as contrasted with *matres Vroicae* (*\*uroica* cf. Ir.

<sup>92</sup> Some hold that the French is borrowed from the English word; but if so, whence came English *flannel*?

<sup>93</sup> Cf. *SprFK* 184-185.

<sup>94</sup> *AcS* I 1485.26-1486.17. I conjecture that this is related to Umb. *eikvasese*, *eikvasatis*.

<sup>95</sup> *Gram. Lat.* V 394. 11 K.

<sup>96</sup> 360 (addendum to 306). Cf. *SprFK* 185, where doubt is expressed, and the observation made that *\*brucus* lies behind *bruyère*.

*froeck*), and suggested that \**bruca*: \**uroica* (*br*: *ur*, *u*: *oi*) point to different Gaulish developments in different dialects. Attempts have been made to distinguish, within Gaul, between two different developments of *m*, *n* (*em*, *en* and *am*, *an*) that would correspond to the Goidelic and Brythonic treatment respectively of those sounds,<sup>97</sup> but the "evidence" is itself hypothetical. Dottin<sup>98</sup> has collected a large number of variants most of which appear to be graphic; and of those which are phonetic very few (e.g. *cantlos* beside *cantalón*) are comparisons of different forms within Gaul; the vast majority are pairs of words, one from Gaul, the other outside of Gaul. Mention was made above of the recent revival of an old scepticism concerning the inscriptions of Narbonensis. Many years ago d'Arbois de Jubainville expressed the opinion, afterwards accepted by Bréal, that the inscriptions containing the words *δεδε* and *βρατουδε* are Italic rather than Keltic; they have been regarded as Ligurian or (by Rhys) as "Celtican." But as Dottin remarked,<sup>99</sup> "on peut, au moins provisoirement, ne pas séparer ces inscriptions des autres inscriptions gauloises." In that case, however, they would seem to belong to a different dialect from the others. From this summary account alone it is evident that no real advance whatever has yet been made towards an interpretation of ancient doctrine concerning the dialects of Gaul.

#### IV. THE ROMANIZATION OF GAUL<sup>100</sup>

Narbonensis, particularly the hinterland of Marseilles, was hellenized first, and then romanized. To speak of a *Gallia Graeca* there is no mere title or phrase. The romanization of Gaul is essentially the fusing of a Graeco-Roman culture with a native Gallic civilization, the Greek

<sup>97</sup> *SprFK* 185-186.

<sup>98</sup> 54-56, 101.

<sup>99</sup> 36-37.

<sup>100</sup> Ernest Desjardins, *Géographie historique et administrative de la Gaule romaine*, 4 vols., 1876-1893; *id.*, *Géographie de la Gaule d'après la Table de Peutinger*, Paris, 1869; Fustel de Coulanges, *Histoire des Institutions politiques de l'ancienne France*, I, La Gaule romaine, revue par . . . C. Jullian, 1908; H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, *Recherches sur l'origine de la Propriété foncière et des noms de lieux habités en France* (période celtique et période romaine), avec la collaboration de G. Dottin, 1890; C. Pallu de Lessert, "L'Oeuvre géographique d'Agrippa et d'Auguste," *Mémoires de la Société nationale des antiquaires de France*, 7e sér., VIII 1909, 215-298; Héron de



element becoming the less pronounced and the less independent the further one moves from the Mediterranean coast. Roman penetration, as usual, begins as a military intervention; again, as often, it ended with the imposition of the Latin language upon the inhabitants of Gaul, and that is the feature in which we are here most interested.

In the course of the second century B.C. Roman armies had appeared in southern Gaul more than once. Assistance was given by Rome to the Greeks of Massilia against Gauls and Ligurians combined in 154 B.C.,<sup>101</sup> but Gallic pressure upon the Greek city was renewed

Villefosse, "Les Agents de recensement dans les trois Gaules," *ibid.*, 8e sér., III 1914, 249-300; A. Blanchet, *Les enceintes romaines de la Gaule*, 1907 (cf. *RC* XXVIII, 1907, 87); Julius Beloch, "Die Bevölkerung Galliens zur Zeit Caesars," *Rh. Mus.*, LIV 1899, 414-445 (but see the criticisms of A. Grenier ap. Frank, *Economic Survey*, III 452-454); Hermann Dessau, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, II 2, 1930, 480-534; Otto Hirschfeld, *Kleine Schriften*, 1913, ii-xi, 19-238; *Notitia Galliarum* (Monumenta Germaniae historica, auctorum antiquissimorum Tomus IX, ed. Th. Mommsen, 1892), with the observations of Duchesne in *Bulletin de la Soc. nat. des antiquaires de France*, 1892, 247-252 (administrative not ecclesiastical basis); J. Markowski, "De Galliis, Hispaniis, Germania in indice rerum gestarum diui Augusti laudatis," *Eos*, XXXIV 1932-33, 427-459; R. Syme, "The Origin of Cornelius Gallus," *CQ*, XXXII 1938, 39-44; Martroye, in *BSAF*, 1926, 285-288 (cf. Collinet, *ibid.* 278), discussing *B.G.*, VI 19.1-2, explains *pecuniae* as "wealth," not "coined money;" Meriwether Stuart, "The Date of the Inscription of Claudius on the Arch of Ticinum [*CIL*, V 6416 19]," *AJA*, XL 1936, 314-322; A. Grenier, "La Gaule indépendante et la Gaule romaine," *Revue des Cours et Conférences*, XXXVIII i, 1936-1937, 98-108; L.-A. Constans, *Guide illustré des campagnes de César en Gaule*, 1929; N. J. DeWitt, *Urbanization and the Franchise in Roman Gaul*, 1940; P. Jacobsthal and E. Neuffer, "Gallia Graeca: Recherches sur l'hellénisation de la Provence," *Préhistoire*, II 1933, 1-64; A. Grenier, *Mnl.* (cf. the review by I. A. Richmond, *Antiquity*, X 1936, 498-501); *id.*, *La Gaule romaine* (see n. 72 above); L. C. West, *Roman Gaul: Objects of Trade*, 1935 (in general, unfavorably reviewed); C. Benedict, *History of Narbo*, 1941 (cf. *CW*, XXXV 1942, 163); Philippe Hélène, *Les origines de Narbonne*, 1937 (cf. the review in *RA* 6e sér., XIII 1937, 181); H. Leclerc, "Pagi de la Gaule," in *Dict. d'archéologie chrétienne*, XIII i, 1937, 380-436 (ecclesiastical divisions correspond to the old *pagi*); Charlotte E. Goodfellow, *Roman Citizenship*, 1935; A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, 1939; on the economic reconstruction of Gaul, see A. Grenier, *Revue des Cours et Conférences*, XXXVIII, 1936-1937, 209-218, 430-441; *Revue des études latines*, XIV 1936, 373-388; on the *concilium* see E. G. Hardy, *Studies in Roman History: First Series*, ed. 2, 1910, 235; D. Vaglieri in *Diz. Epigr. s.v.*; J. S. Reid, *Municipalities of the Roman Empire*, 1913; see also the relevant chapters in *CAH*, which I have found helpful.

<sup>101</sup> Polybius XXXIII 8-10; Livy, *per.* xlvii.



within thirty years, and culminated (125-118 B.C.) in the establishment of the *provincia Narbonensis*, and, in the long run, in the permanent occupation of Gaul by Rome. This began with Roman intervention (125-123 B.C.) against the Salluuii,<sup>102</sup> and a temporary fortification (*castellum*) at Aquae Sextiae, established in order to keep open communication between Italy and Spain,<sup>103</sup> was converted into a fixed or permanent camp (*castra stativa*); it was but a day's march north of Massilia, to which it afforded good protection. In 121 B.C., therefore, steps were taken to reduce the warring tribes and to pacify the territory of Massilia;<sup>104</sup> the Allobroges were defeated on the Rhone between Orange and Avignon, and a road (the *via Domitia*) constructed from Tarascon to the Col du Perthus. These operations, together with the defeat of the Aruerni not far from Valence, sealed the fate of southern Gaul. The Narbonese province was established, then, at the end of the second century B.C., and secured by the foundation of the military colony of Narbo Martius (118 B.C.),<sup>105</sup> but the greater part of the coastal strip of territory from Montpellier to Nice still belonged to Massilia, though the Ligurian and Keltic cantons of the interior were no more subject to the Greek city than before.

Gaul was thrown into confusion afresh by the wandering hordes of Cimbri and Teutones (with some accompanying Kelts) in 111 and 110 B.C.; and the defeat inflicted by them upon the Romans in 109 B.C. left both Provincia and Italy open to attack for some years after 105 B.C. Meanwhile the Cimbri moved into Spain and the Teutones roved through Gaul. It was only their defeats at Aquae Sextiae (102 B.C.) and Campi Raudii (Vercellae) a year later that removed the peril from the gates of Italy. A year before, in the course of his campaigns against these invaders, Marius had caused a canal to be cut at the mouth of the Rhone,<sup>106</sup> the *fossa Mariana*, that ensured the development of Arles. About the same time (103 B.C.) the Cimbri and Teutones were contending with the Belgae, and six thousand of their

<sup>102</sup> Livy, *per.* lx.

<sup>103</sup> Livy, *per.* lxi; cf. *Act. Triumph.* 123, 122.

<sup>104</sup> *Act. Triumph.* 120.

<sup>105</sup> Cicero, *Brut.* 43; Vell. Pat. I 15; cf. II 7.8; Eutrop. IV 23.

<sup>106</sup> R. D. Oldham, "The Age and Origin of the Lower Rhone," has an interesting account of the Rhone delta, with identifications of some ancient sites, in *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society of London*, XC 1934, 445-461.

number are said to have been left behind in the Meuse valley, where later they were known as the Atuatici. Thus the prestige of Rome in Gaul was temporarily restored, but plans for colonies to be planted there, apart from some allotments in 100 B.C., came to nothing.

First, then, their interest in the overland route to Spain through southern Gaul,<sup>107</sup> and then the necessity for holding the northern invaders back, brought about active military intervention of the Romans. But once these needs had been filled, latinization and exploitation of Provence began and continued apace and uninterruptedly, until, as Cicero remarked in 69 B.C.,<sup>108</sup> no business transaction in Narbonensis could be completed without the intervention of a Roman citizen as middleman. These *negotiatores* played an important part in the romanization; Narbonensis, already in part hellenized, now received an Italian stamp and long retained it; it was more completely romanized than any other part of Gaul, and to this day its Roman ruins bear witness to the truth of Pliny's assertion that Narbonensis was one with north Italy.<sup>109</sup>

Before Caesar's wars in Gaul (58-51 B.C.) the Roman domain extended as far as Toulouse, Vienne, and Geneva; after them, it had expanded to the Atlantic Ocean on the west and north, and along the whole course of the Rhine easterly. Many tribes had indeed been bound to Rome by treaty (*foedus*),<sup>110</sup> but the conquest of Gallia Comata, whence later were formed three imperial provinces of Aquitania, Lugdunensis, and Belgica, destined to be united by the imperial cult also, was Caesar's achievement. Although, therefore, Roman authority had been restored in Transalpine Gaul after the battles of Aquae Sextiae and Campi Raudii, outside its borders the Keltic tribes continued to struggle among themselves for the supremacy, and even Transalpina revolted in 77 B.C., only to be defeated by Pompey on his march to Spain. But the ruthless exactions of the Romans that followed the defeat provoked a desperate situation, and in 63 B.C. the

<sup>107</sup> Cic., *pro Font.*, V 13: *specula populi Romani*.

<sup>108</sup> *Op. cit.*, V 11.

<sup>109</sup> *NH*, III 31: *Narbonensis Italia uerius quam prouincia*.

<sup>110</sup> Cicero, *pro Balbo* 32; Tac. *Hist.*, IV 67; Amm. Marc., XV 12.5; Pliny, *NH*, IV 106-107.

Allobroges appealed for relief directly to Rome. Receiving no satisfaction, in 61 they revolted and again were "pacified" after a fashion. These troubles, and what was perhaps more dangerous for undisturbed Roman control in southern Gaul, namely the contest for hegemony that kept central Gaul in a turmoil, and the intrigues that went on constantly among the Gauls themselves both inside and outside of Narbonensis, brought about a series of events that led first to the intervention of Caesar, as governor of Provincia (58 B.C.), where he had tried to meet the needs of the Gauls as far as possible, and then to a military occupation by him that ended, in 51 B.C., in the final subjugation of the whole of Gaul. Thanks to Caesar's conciliatory policy, there was little trouble for many years thereafter, so that the *pax Romana* started to extend Roman civilization and the Latin language throughout the length and breadth of the vast provinces that Caesar had added to the Roman empire with a frontier on the Rhine.

The generous allotments made to Caesar's veterans, as, for example, of the sixth legion at *Arelate* (Arles) and of the tenth at *Narbo Martius* (Narbonne), both in the old province of Transalpine Gaul, that part of the ancient Mediterranean world outside Italy which was already most Italian in character and most italianized in tradition, hastened the process of romanization. But although the enfranchisement of the Transpadana in 49 B.C. had prepared the way for further enfranchisement in romanized regions, the assassination of Caesar himself in 44 B.C. prevented the fulfilment of whatever plans he may have had for enfranchising romanized urban communities beyond the Alps, and Caesar was so far in advance of his contemporaries in his liberal attitude toward provincials that, despite the advance of Roman civilization and of the Latin language in and beyond the Alpine regions, anything more than the gift of citizenship to certain individuals was long delayed.

Narbonensis remained separate from Gallia Comata, however. Caesar had tied it administratively with Spain,<sup>111</sup> while the rest of Gaul was subdivided into two divisions. Lepidus also had administered Narbonensis together with Spain, but Antonius reunited all Gaul, and after Philippi the *Provincia* was joined with the rest of Gaul. The provincial command of Transalpine Gaul had been assigned to

<sup>111</sup> Dio Cass., XLIII 51.8.

Antonius in 44 B.C. for a period of five years; Decimus Brutus he dislodged. After 40 B.C., however, it was Augustus who had control of Gaul (except Narbonensis), and in due course it was he who organized the four Gallic provinces (including Narbonensis). The Civil wars had annihilated Massilia politically; in theory it continued free of the empire, a Greek city, but as a small provincial town, that played the same rôle in Gaul that Naples had done in Italy. Some four years later, Octavian, following the example of Caesar, established a colony for veterans of the seventh legion at Baeterrae in Narbonese Gaul, and about 32 B.C. he received the submission of the three Gauls and of Germany, whose chieftains swore an oath of allegiance to him, as he himself records in his *Res Gestae*.<sup>112</sup>

It is true that Augustus "pacified" Gaul and that his "pacification" was not disrupted, despite sundry localized conflicts during the decade 38 to 28 B.C. But notwithstanding these outward marks of conquest, the people of Gaul were almost as far from being completely settled, especially in the north and west, as they had been after the campaign of Agrippa seven years before. Hence again in 29 and 28 B.C. we find the Romans obliged to suppress rebellions among certain tribes, the Suebi, Morini, and Treueri; Messalla defeated the Aquitanians in 28-27 B.C. not far from Narbonne, and it was perhaps about this time that fourteen Keltic tribes living between the Loire and the Garonne were transferred, in a general re-organization of the Gauls under Augustus, to Aquitania and joined to the many but small Iberian communities who lived between the Garonne and the Pyrenees.<sup>113</sup> This transfer was in accord with the geographical conditions, but it was none the less temporary: within three centuries at the most the Aquitani were separated from the Gauls north of the Garonne (the "*Nouempopuli*") once more.<sup>114</sup>

Augustus visited Gaul four times in all between 27 and 8 B.C.; first, after the principate was established (28 B.C.), on his journey to and

<sup>112</sup> V 4-5, 10-12, 17, 36.

<sup>113</sup> See J. P. Postgate, *CR*, XVII 1903, 112 (the chief ancient authorities are Strabo IV, C 189-190; Pliny *NH*, IV 108).

<sup>114</sup> See the insc. of Hasparren, CIL XIII 412 (*CLE* 260), the date of which is disputed (third century after Christ according to Grenier, *La Gaule rom.*, 435; second century, Jullian, *REA*, IV 1902, 46); Salvianus, *de gub. dei*, VII 8.



from Spain (27-26 B.C.), when the administrative rearrangements were being made that broke even Narbonensis away from the senate and made it an imperial province (though in 22 B.C. it was returned to the senate,<sup>115</sup> so that its distinctive position in Gaul, among other causes, contributed to its separate development); a second time in 16 B.C., in the course of an absence from Rome that lasted three years, at the end of which period (13 B.C.) Tiberius was made *legatus* of the three Gauls, i.e. the three praetorian provinces (Lugdunensis, Belgica, and Aquitania), an arrangement which renewed the territorial division that Caesar had found in 58 B.C. (together these provinces numbered sixty-four *ciuitates*); third, in 10 B.C., when he was at Lyons; and last of all in 8 B.C., when he returned to Gaul after the death of Drusus. Each of these visits was occupied in dealing with administrative and other questions, which included the organization of the two Germanies — military areas, which only later became provinces. In 19 B.C. Agrippa was in Gaul as governor; and the campaigns of 17-14 B.C., when the Alpine passes were secured, and the political arrangements made which placed the three small but important frontier military districts of the Maritime Alps, the Cottian Alps, and Graian Alps, together with the territory of the Raeti and Vindelici, and four tribes of the Vallis Poenina, under equestrian governors, prefects, equestrian prefects or procurators, as well as the census conducted in 27 B.C., again in 12 B.C.,<sup>116</sup> and yet again after the death of Augustus (this was conducted by Germanicus in A.D. 15), were all part of the general policy of the pacification and settlement of Gaul.

As we have seen, the old three-fold division of the country was found not quite practicable by Augustus — the purely Keltic tribes between the Garonne and the Loire were assigned to Aquitania which would otherwise have been disproportionately small; and the left bank of the Rhine, from lake Geneva as far north as the Moselle, was joined with Belgica, though most of these cantons included tribes counted *Celtae* by Caesar. In general, the Keltic division (*Celtica*, or “*Gallica*”) preponderated, however, so that together the expression the “three Gauls” is justified.

Sporadic risings occurred from time to time, as for example when

<sup>115</sup> As far as the territory of the Aedui, Tac. *Ann.* XI 25.

<sup>116</sup> Livy, *per.* cxxxix.

the people of Nemausus overthrew the statues of Tiberius.<sup>117</sup> These were not unnaturally provoked by census-taking and the levying of taxes, but they sprang also from internal feuds and from the discord that was rife among the Keltic tribes. Even after the days of Augustus difficulties often arose in imposing tribute on the tribes of Gaul. More serious were the revolts of Keltic nobility on a larger scale led by Julius Florus and Julius Sacrovir (A.D. 21), after which there was a determined attempt to disarm the natives at the same time that the druids were suppressed; and again, the rebellion led by Vindex that preceded the downfall of Nero (A.D. 68),<sup>118</sup> which for a time seemed as if it might succeed in its declared object of establishing an independent *imperium Galliarum*. The Keltic cantons were raised and a Gallic empire of Julius Classicus proclaimed among the Treueri, of Julius Sabinus among the Lingones. But all this ended in farcical tragedy. In the long run the insurrection could not succeed, and the turn of the tide came early; a year later (A.D. 70), the power of Rome was restored, and thereafter the process of romanization went on undisturbed.

As for the rôle played by the druids,<sup>119</sup> the united druids, as Caesar described them, belonged actually to the monarchical period in Gaul, before 112 B.C. Their unity, in fact, was dependent upon a measure of political unity, and declined with it. It was the social and political revolutions that took place during the last century of Gallic independence and the early years of the Roman period that brought about the weakening of the druidical power and organization.

Nevertheless, in some ways there was a survival of Gallic sentiment. The *ara ad confluentes*, for example, fostered a feeling of Gallic individuality in the Tres Galliae, such as found open expression in the revolt of A.D. 70; and such as still lasted on in the time of Gallienus to launch the Gauls on a line of action of their own. But such influences were rare. And there were many and more powerful influences that worked in the opposite direction.

Rome being traditionally jealous of her privileges,<sup>120</sup> even the Trans-

<sup>117</sup> Suetonius, *Tib.* 13. This seems to have occurred towards the end of Tiberius' retirement in Rhodes, perhaps c. 1 B.C.

<sup>118</sup> Tac., *Hist.*, I 65; IV 17; Dio Cass., *frag.* LXIII 22.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. N. J. DeWitt, *TAPA* LXIX 1938, 319-322.

<sup>120</sup> Note especially Suetonius *Iul.* 80.

padanes had not received the franchise until 49 B.C. But the stage of *attributio* was attained in the Transpadana in 89 B.C. under the Lex Pompeia, and this was an important step towards romanization, by which less advanced communities were placed under the protection of a neighboring city, and through it they paid *tributum*. The *attributi* were practically on an equal footing with the people of the place to which they were attached, and gradually the distinction disappeared,<sup>121</sup> and hence the process of romanization was hastened, even though the grant of franchise was delayed. Julius Caesar probably intended to apply the same liberal policy to the Transalpines that he had to the Cisalpines, but his successors were more cautious. Those cities of Narbonensis which were not *coloniae civitatis Romanae*, by virtue of being settlements of veterans, seem in fact to have received Latin rights, so that the province, at Caesar's death, was very much in the same position as Cisalpine Gaul during the years 89 to 49 B.C. The extension of the franchise beyond the Alps was therefore merely part of a larger policy of Caesar, who had sympathies that went far outside the frontiers of Italy. But it is clear that in Gaul the people in general were not ripe for Roman citizenship. There were still extensive areas in which there were no regular cities, the unit being the tribe and not the city. Augustus, so far from being ready to enfranchise all the Gauls, is recorded as having on occasion refused the grant of the franchise even for a particular Gaul who had been recommended for it, lest it should be too easily won, and thereby cheapened. But despite occasional disturbances, and despite the difficulties of maintaining security along the frontier of the Rhine, which the Germans were astride and which was still but lightly held, Gaul began to move towards a new prosperity, almost without interruption, once the entire country had succumbed to Caesar and peace had been declared.

To natural communications along waterways — helped out by portages — were added good roads, for example, the one constructed in 27 B.C. by Agrippa, from Lugdunum to open up new country; agriculture was supplemented by commerce and town-life fostered. Fortunes were made in rapidly growing cities not only at Narbonne or Arles, but at Bordeaux or Lyons, or even Trèves. Currency in circu-

<sup>121</sup> On Brixia (the canton Brescia) cf. Note C below.



lation increased enormously, and instead of the crude imitation of Greek types (with Keltic inscriptions in some cases) or original types, we find Roman types copied and the Latin alphabet in use for the inscriptions. About the same date (27 B.C.) Aquitania was pacified and in the main the Gauls were loyal to their new governors. The visits of Augustus, and his complete reorganization of the country contributed not only to the growing trade and prosperity, but also to the increasing diffusion of Roman civilization. Narbonensis<sup>122</sup> already had abandoned war for agriculture and urban life; stock-farming was extensively practiced, and by Augustan times the manufacture of *terra sigillata* had begun on a large scale, for example at La Graufesenque, to be carried on later at other centres, for example Lezoux (after A.D. 50).<sup>123</sup> There was an active trade north and south in these "Samian" wares (as they used to be called), which became fashionable all over western Europe, but Gaul was predominant in output, though Germany had native manufactories. Industrial relations sprang up between Gaul and Spain, Italy, the Danubian lands, Africa, Britain and elsewhere, as this one merchandise alone testifies. Some measure of the prosperity of a land traditionally rich is afforded by the gift of four million sesterces sent from Lyons to Rome to help in the restoration of the city after the fire of A.D. 64. Handicrafts of every kind are named in the Latin inscriptions of Gaul. From having been merely a new master to Gaul, therefore, Rome rapidly became a leader. Tiberius had new roads laid out in Narbonensis, and the old ones repaired. And if the visit of Gaius in A.D. 40 contributed little or nothing to the development of the provinces, Claudius not only fostered their material progress by planting colonies at Lugdunum Conuenarum in Aquitania, and among the Vbii, but also bestowed the highly valued privileges of the *ius Latii* or in many cases the whole franchise. It was under his principate that Gauls began to be admitted to magistracies and to the senate, despite vigorous opposition in Rome, admirably expressed by Seneca in the *Apocolocyntosis*,<sup>124</sup> — as it appears, Gallic nobles might be enrolled in the senate, and any Roman citizen of Gaul

<sup>122</sup> Strabo IV, C 190.

<sup>123</sup> Estimates of date vary; compare *CAH* X 405 with *CAH* XI 503.

<sup>124</sup> vi (cf. iii), a reference which I owe to Dr H. Bloch; Tac., *Ann.* XI 23-25; Dessau 112.



was eligible for election to office. From the famous inscription *CIL* XIII 1668 we know that Claudius proposed the *ius honorum* for certain Gauls: a rich noble might thus become a Roman senator when Claudius threw open the senate to provincial citizens of Gallia Comata — a strange contrast to earlier days when a wealthy Gaul would eagerly barter a slave in exchange for a jar of wine.<sup>125</sup> In republican times extension of the franchise would have been unthought of. It was only under the principate that there was gradually achieved the inclusive imperial citizenship. In this the policy of Claudius was far more generous than anything that Augustus or Tiberius had considered wise. Besides special grants made freely to individuals or entire communities, the enfranchisement of non-Italian troops on their discharge became the rule; and, at last, in A.D. 212, Caracalla made all but the most backward tribes citizens of Rome. Thus Gaul partook of what was the general imperial policy. Reorganization was from time to time necessary, as under Diocletian, but this did not interrupt the steady development of the provinces.

As for the Germanic tribes on the left bank of the Rhine, they were allowed to retain their native institutions. Even in Gaul proper the tribal system had been left intact. Representatives of the three Gauls were brought together in the annual assembly of the *concilium Galliarum* at Lyons,<sup>126</sup> which thus inspired a growing sense of unity in the native population. Even Caesar had held these conventions of the nobles during his campaigns,<sup>127</sup> and in imperial times they served to convince local opinion that it was not utterly disregarded. Many Gauls were entrusted with the command of military units, and a few, like Vindex, were raised to the position of governor of a province. If in his case this trust was misplaced, on the whole the Gauls were beginning to acquire a firm sense of loyalty to Rome. On the frontier of the Rhine, the activity of Trajan in building roads and fortifications before his return to Rome in A.D. 99 added a new sense of security.

Several factors played a part in the process of romanization. (1) Once any territory was annexed to Rome, there always followed an emigration of numbers of Italian-born speakers of Latin for the pur-

<sup>125</sup> Diod. Sic., V 26.3-4.

<sup>126</sup> *CIL* XIII pp. 227 ff.

<sup>127</sup> *B.G.* IV 6.5; V 2.4; VI 3.4; cf. I 30.

poses of private trade and the collection of public and private revenue, and of these the traders frequently settled in the new territories and took root there. They were followed, especially in Narbonensis, by peasant-settlers who actually farmed the land. There was, then, a marked drift of population from Italy towards the west that had set in by the second century B.C. Polybius noted the existence of Roman milestones in Transalpine Gaul even in his own day, as well as the important sea-going traffic of the Rhone. The existence of commercial relations between the Hellenistic east and the Italo-Keltic west is attested also by the fact that Keltic coinage begins about the first half of the third century B.C. It must by no means be supposed, therefore, that Gaul lived in a state of complete barbarism before the Roman conquest. There was a fairly stable political and social life, especially in Narbonensis, not without comforts or knowledge of the arts. But everywhere the political horizon was a limited one; there was no great state, and commerce was narrow. There was little urban life, save in a few places, to which foreign influence had permeated. Rome expanded both the political and the commercial horizon. This expansion was accomplished through a small minority of immigrant settlers who diverted the activities of the mass into a new channel. Although, therefore, the Gauls gradually conformed to a Roman way of life, received the grant of citizenship and might thus rise to the governing class, yet Gaul continued to be inhabited by Gauls. The great mass of the people were now becoming farmers and artisans; there was a certain survival not only of the native language but of native culture, with which the process of romanization came less into conflict than with language, and the three Gauls at least remained for some time related by language. But the civilization of Roman Gaul is a mixture of Gallic and Roman elements. Old habits of dress and housing died hard; something of old Keltic customs and unruliness survived. The foundations of this Romano-Gallic culture were laid by Caesar and Augustus, just as were the foundations of the modern Romance language that we call French. And even it was affected by the old native language so long as that was spoken.

(2) Next there is to be noted the effect of military settlements. The late W. Meyer-Lübke was one of the first to recognize the importance of permanent encampments (*castra stativa*) of the Roman standing

army in spreading Latin and developing the several Romance dialects. The military colonies of Caesar and Augustus in Narbonensis as elsewhere quickly passed beyond the stage of being merely military colonies; Arles (*Arelate*), which in those days could be reached by sea-going vessels up the Rhone, became a commercial center in the first century of our era, and a century later had surpassed and displaced the old Greek foundation of Massilia. Nor was it merely the units of the camp for the time being that counted. There was also the continuous process of recruitment and discharge. During the Julio-Claudian period, when the legions were chiefly of Italian blood, and again later, when more provincials were enrolled, time-expired soldiers tended to settle where they had been stationed.<sup>128</sup> Still later, under Hadrian, this became the normal practice; and, at the same time, it was also regular for the garrisons to obtain recruits from the districts in which they were stationed. Besides, Roman citizenship followed as a rule on discharge; the auxiliary troops associated with an army that spoke Latin, and were commanded by officers who were Roman in outlook and Italian in tone. No wonder if the permanent camps brought the provincials rapidly into contact with Roman civilization. So long as recruits were raised in Italy, the legions took many thousands of Italians permanently to Gaul, and at the same time spread the language and ideals of Rome and Italy among the native population through troops afterwards locally enrolled.<sup>129</sup> And in most cases, at least in Gaul, the camps led to the formation of nearby civilian settlements, through which they were even more effective as centres of Roman influence: first came the demand for agricultural produce from military lands, then the growth of markets (*canabae*), with their swarms of traders, and finally a permanent town. Examples of this course of development often named, even outside of Gaul, are Vetera in lower Germany, or the *canabae* at Carnuntum which became a *municipium* in the time of Hadrian, or Moguntiacum which was progressing to that stage by the end of the third century;<sup>130</sup> there are exceptions of course — thus Argentorate always remained a market associated with the camp. But whatever stage of development was

<sup>128</sup> Tac., *Ann.* XIV 27.

<sup>129</sup> Cf. Aristides XXVI 75 ff., K.

<sup>130</sup> *CIL* XIII 6727.



reached, everything tended to bring Rome and Italy to the provinces. For there were always groups of Italians who settled in the provinces without military reasons, and except in the most remote districts there could usually be found a *conuentus ciuium Romanorum* acting under the protection of a *curator*. The institution of this latter was due probably to Trajan.

(3) Last of all, and most important, was the attitude of the Romans, especially in imperial times, to the provincials whom they governed. They were not "superior," but on the contrary "receptive in their turn," so that they "escaped the failure of the cultural crusade." Rome's prestige grew inevitably in proportion to the growing gratitude of the provincials to the authors of the *pax Romana*. For if the world was at peace, that peace, which Gaul enjoyed in common with the other provinces, depended for its preservation on Rome. Naturally, devotion to the imperial power grew in strength and found expression in the wide-spread imitation of its buildings, institutions, and language. A prosperous town always was eager to become a colony, with the suggestion of closer connexion with Rome which the status of *colonia* implied, and citizenship came to be an object of justifiable ambition and pride. It can hardly be supposed that the Roman citizenship did not imply some acquaintance with and knowledge of the civilization and language that lay behind it.

The contrast, however, between Narbonensis and the Tres Galliae is deeply marked, and cannot be too much emphasized. In the former romanization went deep. Narbonensis was already Mediterranean in character and had been affected by long standing Greek influences, so that it was part of the early nucleus of the empire. But the Tres Galliae served rather to support the two Germanies and so to protect the empire. In Narbonensis there was a large number of towns and cities, many of which ancient testimony and modern research agree in showing to have been centers in which Roman civilization had planted its roots firmly: Tacitus<sup>131</sup> remarked on the progress of letters at Massilia; from Arles we have an unusually large number of inscriptions testifying to the popularity of that Roman institution the *collegium* or trade-guild; *Nemausus* (Nîmes) had its famous buildings in the Roman style, still partly extant, from the time of Augustus;<sup>132</sup> *Tolosa*

<sup>131</sup> *Agr.* I. Cf. *CAH* XI 445.

<sup>132</sup> *Mela* 2.75; cf. *CIL* XII 3151.



(Toulouse) was known for its learning and oratory; <sup>133</sup> Vienne (*Vienna*), Aix-en-Provence (*Aquae Sextiae*), *Baeterrae*, *Cularo*, *Forum Iulii* (Fréjus), *Narbo*, *Valentia* (Valence), all were sharing in the same rapid progress; at *Vasio* (Vaison) excavations conducted within the last decade have revealed an unsuspected city altogether Mediterranean in character, quite as much Hellenistic as Roman.<sup>134</sup> The younger Pliny<sup>135</sup> tells us of the *eques*, who after having fulfilled his term of military service and administrative work as procurator in Narbonese Gaul, took up agriculture and literature, turning his farm into a miniature "Athens;" and the contribution of *Provincia* to Roman letters is well known from names such as those of Cornelius Gallus, Pompeius Trogus, Votienus Montanus, Domitius Afer and Rutilius Namatianus. No wonder, then, if, with its important Italian leaven, this old province was latinized at once and completely; its distinctive form of Romance language, the *Langue d'oc*, in fact still survives as something different from French, perhaps from a different substratum. It has often been remarked that there is a certain difference in the names of the modern cities in Provence (e.g. Nîmes from *Nemausus* — not from *Volcae*) and in France, where they are tribal (e.g. Paris from *Parisiis*, not from *Lutecia*). Arles and Fréjus, with the larger centres such as *Auennio*, *Aquae Sextae*, *Apta Iulia*, organized on the basis of Latin rights, were virtually Italian communities within the Gallic cantons, and Arles the true heir of that great emporium of Gallo-Italic commerce, the Greek city of Massilia. Something of Hellenistic culture survived in the south, just as romanization was always stronger in the east of Gaul than in the west and north. But, generally speaking, we may say that the lower Rhone was romanized on both banks, both in language and in manners, by the end of the Augustan age; even the remnants of the cantonal organization were but slight. Architecture too tells the same story; in the cities of Narbonese Gaul, beside the hellenizing or Hellenistic features, we have the magnificent structures of the early empire and succeeding years in the grand Roman style. Perhaps it is chiefly in the minor arts that there remains something of an independ-

<sup>133</sup> Martial IX 99; Hieron., *Chron.* an. 2072; cf. *AcS* II 1878.

<sup>134</sup> See the works of J. Sautel, *CA* fasc. vii, pp. xxiv-xxv.

<sup>135</sup> *Ep.* VII 25.

ent Keltic spirit, as in the picture of an artisan and his tools on a Gallic *cippus*. But, after all, the flourishing of the arts was dependent in a large degree upon the *pax Romana*, with its economic prosperity and rise in population.

The Tres Galliae present the greatest contrast with all this. The process of romanization was slower and less intensive. Gallic speech survived later; for there were no colonies, since the old cantons were preserved. In the Rhine districts in particular Roman influences permeated slowly. In Aquitania we hear only of Burdigala (Bordeaux) as a centre of Latin learning and literature; in Lugdunensis there was an important centre for the training of Gallic youth, after the Roman manner instead of the displaced native one, namely *Augustodunum* (now Aûtun), Lugdunum being the political centre. In fact this Gallic capital was the only city in the three Gauls organized on a basis that so many towns enjoyed in *Prouincia*; the Keltic diet of the three provinces met there, but later even it fell behind Trèves. The three Gauls, we must remember, extended properly as far as the Rhine, though the Vbii were not part of the sixty-four cantons; but the Heluetii and Triboci were included among them, the Heluetii and Sequani being counted by Caesar<sup>136</sup> among the Celtae. Caesar, of course, excluded or ignored the old Roman *Prouincia*; and for him the Treueri seem to have been reckoned with the Celtae, though it is not absolutely certain in what group he placed them. At a later date the Sequani were counted in Upper Germany (to the end of the third century of our era), and even the Lingones also in Upper Germany (to the end of the second century). In Belgica the only important towns were Durocortorum and, definitely so reckoned, the Treueri. The three Gallic provinces, then, maintained the old organization into cantons, *pagi* or *ciuitates*, and being more or less denuded of native troops, were left with a civilian population among whom was slowly disseminated the Helleno-Roman culture of the Mediterranean. The nearer the frontier was approached on the Roman side, the more pronounced this became, on the German side, the less pronounced. The two Germanies were originally military commands established on the Rhine — Upper Germany to take in the Heluetii, Sequani, Lingones, Rauraci, Triboci, Nemetes, and Vangiones, and Lower Germany the

<sup>136</sup> I 1.2-4.

Vbii, Tungri, Menapii, Bataui — these last named being originally Keltic; so Metz and Trèves both fell in the three Gauls. Clearly if they left it undisturbed in Gaul, the Romans must have left the old cantonal system undisturbed, as in fact they did, in the Germanies and in Raetia. Trajan did something to forward a sort of romanization by his building of roads in the Germanic provinces, before he returned to Rome in A.D. 99. Although, therefore, we find the Roman form of expression in the Germanies as in the Gauls, this romanization was by comparison, quite superficial. Native Germanic names of deities (e.g. Nerthus, *fem.*) survived as did Keltic in Gaul — sometimes along the Rhine Keltic and Germanic names are not so easily distinguished one from another — but where romanization was effective, in religion or in other spheres, its subjects were mostly of the Gallo-Roman immigrant class. Keltic name-material, it is true, survives, but its bulk is often less than would be expected, and its very occurrence, therefore, proportionately deceptive. Thus, an examination of the names of the Treueri<sup>137</sup> reveals only 16.5 % Keltic names against 63.5 % Italo-Roman and 20.0 % non-Keltic. But even these figures may be misleading, for there were many valid reasons why Italian or Roman names might be favored to the point of adoption. In Raetia the advance of Roman civilization was also long delayed, and the same delay obtained both among the Vindelici and in the neighboring lands — the *agri decumates*, all of them territories in which Keltic peoples had at one time lived.

#### V. THE END OF KELTIC IN GAUL<sup>138</sup>

How long did any Keltic dialect continue to be spoken in Gaul? This question has often been asked, and there is a certain amount of direct evidence from which to answer it. Again, to what extent may

<sup>137</sup> L. Weisgerber, *Rh. Mus.*, LXXXIV 1935, 289.

<sup>138</sup> See *Do.* 69-79; *SprFK* 176-179; Nyrop, *Grammaire historique de la langue française*, I ed. 2, 1904, 5-7; Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française* I, 1905, 17-37; M. K. Pope, *From Latin to Modern French*, 1934, 1-6, 16-18, 70, 89, 136-137 (with the authorities cited, viz. Meyer-Lübke, *Gr. Fr.*, §§ 48, 50; *Einführung* § 221 and pp. 207-216 in ed. 2; *Zts. f. frz. Spr. u. Lit.* XLI 1-7; XLIV 75-84; XLV 350-351); Vendryes, "Celtique et Roman," in *Revue de linguistique romane* I, 1925, 262-277; W. von Wartburg, *Évolution et structure de la langue française*, ed. 2, 1934, 11-21;



the influence of Keltic upon the Latin spoken in Gaul, and its modern descendants, the dialects of France, be traced? To what date do such influences go back? For clearly Keltic was not altogether extinct so long as it could affect the popular Latin of Gaul. These questions may well be considered together.

That a certain number of Keltic words, e.g. *leuga*, taken over into Gallo-Latin, survived long enough to appear in modern French (*lieue*, Eng. *league*, a measure of length), is well known. Others are: *arpent* (*arepennis*), *brueil* (*brogilos*), *bruyère* (*\*uroikos*, dial. *\*urūkos*, *\*brukos* and *\*uraukos*, *\*braukos*), *charue* (*carruca*), *chouan* (*cauannus*), *changer* (*cambiare*), *encombrer* (*combrī*), *vassal* (*uassallus*), *veltre* (*uerträḡus*). A longer list may be found in R. Thurneysen's *Kelto-romanisches* (1884), and to his collections later gleanings have added not a few items.<sup>139</sup>

id., *Die Entstehung der romanischen Völker*, Halle, 1939; B. A. Terracini, "Sostato," in *Scritti in onore di Alfredo Trombetti*, Milan 1938, 321-364.

On the problems of Vulgar Latin in general, see also H. F. Muller, *A Chronology of Vulgar Latin*, Halle, 1929 (Heft LXXVIII of the *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*); F. George Mohl, *Introduction à la Chronologie du Latin vulgaire*, 1899; W. Meyer-Lübke, "Die vorromanischen Volkssprachen," in Gröber's *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie* ed. 2, I 1904-06, 451-497; K. von Ettmayer, "Vulgärlatein," in Streitberg's *Geschichte der indogermanischen Sprachwissenschaft*, II i, 1916, 231-280.

<sup>139</sup> See, for example, Vendryes, *loc. cit.* 274 (*baume, ouche*), and, above all, the great etymological dictionary of W. Meyer-Lübke, *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, ed. 3, 1935, in which many words are traced back to recorded or restored Keltic forms; cf. the still incomplete *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (since 1922) of W. von Wartburg (with the reviews by H. Pedersen in *Litteris* II 77-94; VII 17-25); much the same ground is covered in E. Gamillscheg's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der französischen Sprache*, 1928; a masterly handling of the whole question of Keltic words in Romance is the review of *Do.* by J. Jud in *Archivum Romanicum*, VI 1922, 188-211, with the series of articles by the same scholar in *Romania*, XLVI 1920, 465-477; XLVII 1921, 481-510 (cf. *RC* XLII, 1925, 241); XLIX 1923, 389-416; LII 1926, 328-344; *Bündner Monatsblatt* 1924, 205-226; *Bull. de dialectologie rom.*, III 1911, 74 (on *nantu-*); (with Aebischer) *Archivum Romanicum*, V 1921, 29-52; single items often appear in the journals (e.g. L. H. Gray, *Romanic Review*, April 1942), but these are usually words for which a Keltic origin is alleged, the Keltic original being unattested. The important articles by Meyer-Lübke in *Zeitschrift für rom. Philologie*, XIX 1895, 94-99, 273-281; XX 1896, 529-535, should not be overlooked. A few Keltic items that survived not only Latin but also the barbarian invasions of the late Empire, chiefly local names, may be gathered from Th. Frings, "Germania Romana," *Teuthonista*: Beiheft 4,



There are, it is true, a number of words, appearing in writers such as Fortunatus (sixth century after Christ), which are not Latin, and which may have been acquired in Gaul.<sup>140</sup> But, apart from the few scraps of direct testimony, the significance of which is not always beyond dispute, the evidence consists entirely in the survival, into medieval and modern times, of Keltic words and names in regions in which Keltic was spoken before the spread of Romance or Germanic idioms. Within recent years, the discussion of Keltic survivals in modern proper names has been actively resumed.

Unfortunately, however, the very important question of date remains without a definite answer. But these recent discussions have revealed clearly the certainty that Keltic must have survived much later, in remote districts, than had generally been admitted, or than the explicit evidence would suggest. Nomenclature is notoriously tenacious, especially toponymy, and it is possible to overestimate its significance. But J. U. Hubschmied has made a strong case for the late survival of Keltic among the Heluetii and their neighbors to the south.<sup>141</sup> All over France Keltic elements are disguised in modern local names, e.g. *-dunum* (Verdun, Laon, Lyon), *-dürum* (Auxerre), *-brīga* (Deneuvres), *-māgos* (Caen, Rouen), *-ācum* (Cambrai), *-iālum* (Bailleul), to mention only a few. The marked weakening of medial syllables (e.g. Nîmes from *Nēmausus*) has suggested to some the influence of an ancient Keltic accentuation.

Commonly, then, as Latin must have been adopted after the conquest by Caesar, Keltic doubtless lingered on in rural districts, perhaps as a second language; a reasonable estimate puts the date of its complete disappearance, even from remote country districts, not earlier

---

1932, and from E. Gamillscheg, *Romania Germanica*, 3 vols., 1934-36. Werner Kaufmann in his Zurich dissertation "Die gallo-romanischen Bezeichnungen für den Begriff 'Wald,'" 1913, has called attention to pre-Roman terms, some of which are not even Keltic (e.g. *barto* in Gascony).

<sup>140</sup> See D. Tardi, *Fortunat*, Paris, 1927, p. 224, for words of "origine barbare." But *leudus* "song," *ganta* "wild goose," *r[h]una* "letter of the alphabet," are Germanic, and *flado* "a kind of cake," *stapio* "a head-dress (?)" not Keltic; . . . *cidar* "tiara," *manzer* "bastard" are Semitic; this leaves, of Tardi's list, only the familiar *raeda*.

<sup>141</sup> "Sprachliche Zeugen für das späte Aussterben des Gallischen," *Vox Romanica*, III 1933, 48-155.

than the fifth century after Christ.<sup>142</sup> From the *Digests*<sup>143</sup> of Ulpian (222–228 A.D.) it is clear that Gaulish must still have been current in many places in the third century, for its use in pledges and trusts (*fideicommissa*) was expressly permitted, and the well-known passage in St Jerome,<sup>144</sup> comparing the language of the Treueri and that of the Galatians, which was Keltic, has been cited frequently to show that Keltic was still spoken in the Rhineland in his day (late in the fourth century). It has been both maintained, however, and also denied that this famous citation actually derives from forbears of the first century B.C., in whom it would be appropriate and from whom it was directly or indirectly copied.<sup>145</sup> Yet, as Loth has pointed out,<sup>146</sup> the inscriptions of Le Morvan which clearly show that Keltic had not become everywhere completely unintelligible, though it was no longer everywhere in common use, date from the third or fourth century of our era, and might, therefore, be claimed as confirming Jerome's assertion. What does weaken that assertion, is the possibility that in Trèves we should expect any non-Latin speech at the end of the fourth or early in the fifth century as likely to have been Germanic as Keltic. Much earlier Irenaeus Bishop of Lugdunum is said to have studied Keltic,<sup>147</sup> perhaps with the intention of preaching in that language. Again, in the middle of the third century, his impending death is said to have been predicted in Keltic to Severus Alexander,<sup>148</sup> who, as is clear from the evidence of papyri,<sup>149</sup> did actually allow the validation of wills in

<sup>142</sup> See, in addition to the works cited in n. 139, Fustel de Coulanges, *La Gaule romaine*, ed. 3, 1908, 125–134.

<sup>143</sup> XXXII I.11: *fideicommissa quocumque sermone relinqui possunt, non solum latina et graeca, sed etiam punica uel gallicana uel alterius gentis*. Fustel de Coulanges, *op. cit.* 127 n. 1 compares the more dubious κελτιστί of Lucian, *Pseudomantis* 51.

<sup>144</sup> *Ep. ad Gal.*, Migne *Patrol. Lat.* XXVI [Hieron. VII] col. 357 a 26.

<sup>145</sup> A. H. Krappe, *RC* XLVI 1929, 126–129. Johann Sofer, "Das Hieronymuszeugnis über die Sprachen der Galater und Treverer," in *Wiener Studien*, LV 1937 (*Festgabe für L. Radermacher*), 148–158, accepts and defends Jerome's statement as an independent observation. Cf. on the general question of the "death" of languages, Vendryes, *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, XXXVI 1935, 4.

<sup>146</sup> *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 1916, 168.

<sup>147</sup> *Contra haeres.*, proem. (Migne VIII 3.4.1), 177 A.D.

<sup>148</sup> Lampr., *Alex.*, 59–60.

<sup>149</sup> See *CAH* XI 447, and the source there cited.

languages other than Latin. Both Vendryes and Brunot<sup>150</sup> hold that the *defensor*-pun in Sulpicius Severus implies a general knowledge of Latin, and that, therefore, the phrase *celtice aut . . . gallice loqui*,<sup>151</sup> also in Sulpicius Severus, proves nothing, for it may not have meant literally "in Keltic," in fact Wilmotte interprets it to mean "talk in Gallo-Latin." The reference to an *incultum transalpini sermonis horrorem* in Pacatus' panegyric on Theodosius (389 A.D.) is likewise unconvincing.<sup>152</sup>

The conclusion to which we come is that Latin was undoubtedly the common language of Gaul, as of the western Empire as a whole, by the third or fourth centuries, especially wherever Christianity was introduced. If, here and there, a fragmentary knowledge of Gaulish survived, the Latin alphabet was used to write it. The language of Rome early took firm root in Narbonensis, and was understood well enough elsewhere in Gaul, even if the mass of the people often must have clung to the native tongue, so that the final disappearance of Keltic was a long-delayed process, the work of generations. After all, native words are quoted not only in Ausonius and Claudian, but also in Venantius Fortunatus and even in Gregory of Tours. Some of these may well have been learned through written sources, but some could have survived from the vernacular to creep into spoken Latin. If, then, Keltic was not favored by the educated classes in Gaul, the people of the country, in contrast with those of the towns, probably remained largely Keltic in speech as well as Gallic in spirit, until the

<sup>150</sup> Vendryes 269; Brunot 17 (see n. 138 above); Sulp. Sev., *vit. Mart.* 9 (363–425 A.D.).

<sup>151</sup> Sulp. Sev., *dial.* I 27; Wilmotte, *Mélanges Tille* [*Sborník Práci venovaných prof. dru Václavu Tillovi*] Prague, 1928, 223. Wilmotte's view seems improbable. In *in uero uel celtice, aut, si mauis, gallice loquere, dummodo Martinum loquaris* there can be no opposition between *celtice* and *gallice* other than "or if you prefer so to call it," which is what *aut, si mauis* must mean here. The words seem to have been literally intended. Compare the story told by Aulus Gellius IX 7.4 of the lawyer, *quasi nescio quid tusce aut gallice dixisset*, which proves the survival of outlandish talk, exactly like the story of Pollio's attack upon Livy's "pataunitas." Moreover, since it was "homo Gallus" who hesitated to talk Latin "apud Aquitanos," he may have been more at home in Gaulish than in Latin, not to mention Iberian. In fact the whole chapter distinctly suggests a variety of speech in fourth-century Gaul. Cf. Gloss. Lat. V 1931, p. 378 (AA, v. 154), CGL V 488. 45; 518, 15; Gellius II 25. 8.

<sup>152</sup> *Pacati paneg. Theodos.* I (Baehrens 271.20).



spread of Christianity, bringing Latin with it, completed what the conquest by arms had begun.<sup>153</sup>

Discounting as much as possible the evidence of local names, which proves little or nothing about the date at which Keltic ceased generally to be spoken, especially in the north-west, where the reintroduction of a Keltic dialect (Breton) in the fifth century of our era makes the problem even more complex, we may confidently accept the judgments of Nyrop (p. 5, § 3) and of Brunot (p. 34) that Keltic was not yet completely extinct in the fourth century, but was far advanced along the road to extinction, and that Latin must have won complete mastery soon after the time of St Jerome, certainly in the fifth, or, at the very latest, in the sixth century of our era. Even so, of words which survived into French, most are, significantly enough, nouns, and all, or nearly all, pertain, again significantly, to rural life.

But Keltic had survived long enough to produce some effect, before it completely disappeared, upon the Latin of Gaul.<sup>154</sup> The change of

<sup>153</sup> On Gaul in the late Empire, see Courtenay Edward Stevens, *Sidonius Apollinaris and his Age*, 1933 (reviewed by O. G. S. Crawford, "Sidonius and his Times," *Antiquity*, VIII 1934, 81-84), Raymond Thouvenot, "Salvian[us] and the Ruin of the Roman Empire," English translation by O. G. S. Crawford, *ibid.*, 315-327; Jacob Peter Jacobsen, *Les Manes* (French translation from the Danish, by E. Philopot), vol. III 1924, "Le sentiment religieux populaire en France" (pp. 13-182 "Le christianisme gallo-roman"); cf. *REA* XXVII 1925, 331; and on the spread of Latin by the church into the Rhineland, Wilhelm Neuss, *Die Anfänge des Christentums im Rheinlande*, ed. 2, Bonn a. Rhein, 1933 (*Rheinische Neujaarsblätter*, 2). But both language and religion travelled along the imperial roads; on these we now have the important work *Le grandi Strade del Mondo romano*, Rome: Istituto di Studi romani, by Grenier and others (cf. *Classical Review* LII 1938, 159; and LIII 1939, 28-30, a review by R. Syme).

<sup>154</sup> The problem is vexed. I have indicated only a few certain items. Those who wish to pursue the problem further should consult: Vendryes, *op. cit.* n. 138 above; A. Brun, "Linguistique et peuplement," *Revue de Linguistique romane*, XII 1936, 165-231 (cf. the critique by C. Bruneau, *ibid.* XIII 1937, 26-32); Jan de Vries, "De hypothese van het keltische Substraat," *Tijdschrift voor Nederl. Taal- en Letterkunde*, L 1931, 181-221; V. Bertoldi, "Sopravvenienze galliche," *RC* XLVI 1929, 16-28 (Alpine regions), L 1933, 327-338, A. Graur, "Ab, ad, apud et cum en Latin de Gaule," *Bull. Soc. Ling.*, XXXIII 1932, 225-298 (G. claims to see Keltic influence in the confusion of these prepositions in the popular Latin of Gaul); as well as the older studies of V. Brøndal, *Substrater og Laan i Romansk og Germansk*, 1917 (condemned by O. Jespersen, *Language*, 200-201) and P. G. Goidànich, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, Beihefte*: Heft 5 (1907), 131-141.



[u] to [y] or of *ct* to *χt* and *it* in French are, what has often been observed, also Keltic, and are therefore commonly ascribed to the influence of the Keltic substratum upon Vulgar Latin as spoken in Gaul; so also is the appearance of the vigesimal system of reckoning (quatre-vingts), the shift of intervocalic *-g-* to *-h-*, which was then lost (e.g. *-bria* for an older *-briga* in local names, or the *uertraha* of Grattius Faliscus, for older *uertraga*), and, in inflexions, the nom. pl. fem. in *-as* (as at La Graufesenque). In Gaulish itself there are isolated instances of variation in writing of intervocalic consonants, analogous to the change *-g-*: *-h-*, as *d*: *ḍ* or *d*: *dz*, *t*: *θ* and *b*: *v* (Cebenna: Cevenna), which likewise are ascribed to Keltic. The argument against the assumption of Keltic influence has been stated by Meyer-Lübke,<sup>155</sup> but it is not convincing, and in the particulars listed above Keltic utterance is generally admitted, and by some scholars, also in the isolative forward pronunciation of vowels.

Divergence between southern and northern Gaul in the spoken language, it has been assumed, in late Latin was due to the divergent organic basis of an Iberian and Ligurian substratum in the south as distinguished from Keltic to the north; and north of the Loire there is also Germanic influence to be reckoned with. Nevertheless, in the north itself there is no trace of a difference that can be clearly drawn between *Belgae* and *Celtae* (*Galli*) in early times other than the presumed Germanic admixture in the former. The commonly made assumption that the influence of the substratum was slighter or slower wherever Latin was superimposed upon Keltic than elsewhere, because of the close relationship between Italic and Keltic, really has little to commend it beyond mere conjecture. We are on much firmer ground in comparing the voicing and opening of single breathed and plosive consonants (intervocalic *b* to *ḃ*, *p* to *b* to *ḃ*), a process which in Gaul gained ground rapidly, with similar changes in Keltic; the opening began as early as the second century, and voicing in the fifth century after Christ.

It has been held, for example by Brunot,<sup>156</sup> that Cicero was exaggerating in his opinion of the extent of romanization, but Cicero's testimony is confirmed by that of Strabo (born 63 B.C.), who speaks

<sup>155</sup> Cf. n. 138 above.

<sup>156</sup> I 23.

of the people of Narbonensis as being Roman in language and custom, if not by that of the later Pliny, who, as we have seen, describes it as Italian rather than as a province. Greek, however, was not dead at Marseilles even in the time of Varro,<sup>157</sup> and was used there and in the vicinity, by the Christian church, a usage which has left its mark even on Provençal. But there is no question of the usage of Greek in daily life except in a very limited area and that not for long after the decline of the Massiliot power. The Belgae, as we have seen, must have spoken Keltic, with some Germanic traits, and were in fact themselves sometimes confused with purely Germanic-speaking tribes. And in Aquitania were Iberians, who were spreading further into Gaul in the early empire. Yet this language also gave way to Latin and to Romance in its Gascon form.

Vexed as is the question of Latin orthography in Gaul, which prevents us from taking at its face value the epigraphic evidence, rare as are the Keltic inscriptions in the Latin alphabet, and granted that there are Latin inscriptions from Gaul even in Republican times, yet it is possible to put the date of the disappearance of Keltic too early. The facts that Latin literature was not merely read, but in due time also written in Gaul (Ausonius c. 310-395 A.D.), that Latin became the medium of education, and in the north the main vehicle for the diffusion of the Christian faith, that it was the language of the soldiers and of slaves as well as of administration and of all but purely local trade, do not seriously weaken the force of evidence which points to a situation comparable with that of Scotland or Wales or Ireland some centuries after the English conquest — in all of which Keltic persisted in remote or forested or highland districts and now even shows signs of new vigor. In that there is a difference. In Gaul Keltic did finally and permanently disappear (apart from its re-introduction in Brittany in the course of the fifth to seventh centuries after Christ); and evidently, when the Franks and other Germanic tribes came in, Latin was strong enough to absorb the invading speech — there was at that date no sign of the survival of Gaulish, or the least possibility of its revival.

The diffusion of Latin was completed, then, by Christian preaching, so that at the collapse of the empire it was the only language of Gaul. But in the second century Christianity itself had not advanced

<sup>157</sup> Ap. Hieron., Migne XXVI col. 354c.

beyond the romanized south. And, so long as Keltic sentiment and religion survived (even in an *interpretatio Romana*), it found expression in the use of the Keltic names at least of deities, whether or not joined with Latin names. But through the Church, Latin in Gaul seems to have gone deeper still, so as to become the universal vernacular. For a time many people, especially in the country-side, must have been bilingual (compare again Wales or Ireland), and in the towns there would be a constantly increasing proportion of those who knew only Latin. Already in the first and second centuries after Christ the schools — for example of Toulouse, Trèves, and Marseilles — aided in the diffusion of Latin, and we see from inscriptions that greetings and salutations were commonly made in that language. At Marseilles Latin eventually effaced Greek, and some Gaulish cities produced famous Latin authors.

Romanization in the Germanies is difficult to estimate. Doubtless it went far in the cities and larger communities. Latin must have been widely known, and it was of course the rule in the army. But inscriptions often show a defective Latinity that tells its own story. This state of affairs presents a certain contrast as compared with latinized Gaul. But even there, besides the direct evidence quoted above, we have the abundant evidence of personal and local nomenclature to show a specialized survival of the Keltic vocabulary, and also the adoption of occasional words as in the names of army manoeuvres,<sup>158</sup> technical expressions relating to cavalry, or to local products (e.g. beer, *ceruesia* Fr. *cervoise*), and a multitude of glosses preserved in ancient writers at a time when Latin was universal for spoken intercourse, and finally the influence of Keltic upon the development of Romance in Gaul. Everything points to a gradual cessation of Keltic that must be reckoned in terms of centuries, and the commonly accepted estimate (fifth to sixth centuries after Christ) cannot be far from the mark.

<sup>158</sup> Arrian, *Tact.*, 43, 2.

NOTE A (p. 27)

*On the name "Ligurian"*

To assert that "Ligurian was a non-Indo-European language" is simply to echo, nay even to re-echo,<sup>159</sup> a preconceived prejudice, as well as to misconceive the nature of the whole problem of linguistic classification. Again, to suggest that the Ligurians were Indo-Europeanized by "proto-Kelts"<sup>160</sup> is to become involved in still more serious error. What Krahe, for example, wrote in the *Hirt Festschrift* I had, of course, read between the publication of *PID* and the writing of my *Foundations of Roman Italy*, and if I passed it over in silence in the latter book, that was because I was then, as I am still, completely unconvinced, not because I had not read it. Here, as heretofore, it is conceded at once, that any Indo-European language or languages of which records are preserved to us in Liguria, that is in the land of the Ligures, whether in Italy or in Gaul, may be presumed to have been introduced there in succession to some pre-Indo-European and non-Indo-European speech, since we know that region to have been inhabited by man from a time far too remote to have been peopled for the first time by speakers of any Indo-European tongue. Thus the dispute is partly nothing more than a dispute about names; it is, however, partly a dispute about linguistic evidence and its classification, partly also a dispute about chronology. Fundamentally there are four questions to be put: (1) What evidence is there, if any, to prove, what is a perfectly valid assumption, namely the existence, in Liguria, of a non-Indo-European language spoken there before the adoption of Indo-European? (2) What is the correct classification of the Indo-European but pre-Latin speech that we find spoken there, Keltic, Italic, or neither? (3) By what names should those pre-Indo-European and Indo-European languages be designated? (4) By whom, and at what date, was that Indo-European language introduced? It is nothing short of astonishing that so many comparative philologists do not see that these are the questions, and that they are fundamental, not only to their own discussions but also to mine. It ought to be unnecessary to say so, but they so far repeat their prejudices or misconceive the problem that it has become necessary for me to state it in this elementary way. Fortunately, since the evidence is already collected and classified, the answers can be stated briefly.

<sup>159</sup> *Year's Work in Classical Studies* 1937, 93. Contrast Pokorny's judgement, *ZfCPH* XXI 1938, 74. But Pokorny's own theory, that what is I. Eu. in Ligurian must have been Illyrian is devoid of foundation, and inconsistent with his "proto-Keltic" theory.

<sup>160</sup> *ZfCPH* XX 1936, 518 (Pokorny).



(1) There is no evidence of the use in Italian (and Gaulish) Liguria, prior to Indo-European, of any non-Indo-European speech other than that contained in proper names of the region, local, personal, and divine. Here the evidence is mixed. Some of the names, and of their constituent elements, are unquestionably non-Indo-European, but the greater part by far are just as unquestionably Indo-European. It was Niedermann, if I mistake not, who first observed, in 1918, that in view of the proper name *Caepiema* (Tab. Gen.), Kretschmer's analysis of *Berigiema* (*ib.*) is by no means assured, and I alluded to Niedermann's observations by my reference to Bertoldi's article in *PID* III 22 s.v. *giem-*, then the latest discussion of that point. If my readers cannot read, that is their misfortune. But if we no longer accept the analysis *Beri-giema*, and the forms *Blustiemelus*, *Lebriemelus* perhaps tell against it in the same direction as *Caepiema*, though *Quiamelius* does not, for it cannot be analysed as *Qu-iam-el-ius* (and if it could *-iam-* is not *-iem-*), neither does *Intimilium*, yet it still stands true that an overwhelmingly large number of proper names from the Ligurian area can be nothing but Indo-European. In fact the total number of these will be diminished now exactly by one, or at the most by three. Nevertheless, it is doubtless true that at one time there was spoken in that area a non-Indo-European language; for, as I said before, we do not suppose that the ancestors of the pre-Latin Indo-European speaking people of Liguria were dumb. But the traces of that non-Indo-European speech are extremely scanty and some of the elements which have been ascribed to it, for example *-a* or *-asca*, are at least just as easily explained, as I have shown elsewhere, as Indo-European.

(2) Since some of the Indo-European proper names from the Ligurian area show features which distinguish them both from Keltic and from Italic, they cannot be correctly classified as belonging to either of those branches of Indo-European. As for the material of the Lepontic inscriptions, the same conclusion holds good, with the qualification that their dialect appears to be more closely related to Keltic than that of the Ligurian proper names does.

(3) Hence it follows that neither Italic nor Keltic can be justified as a linguistic designation either of the Indo-European proper names of Liguria or of the dialect of the Lepontic inscriptions. "Proto-Keltic," which is Pokorny's label, at least for the onomastic material, is no better, for it only means "earliest Keltic," and their dialect is not Keltic, either early or late, but only closely related to Keltic, just as it is related, and as closely, to Italic. The term proto-Keltic is fantastic as applied to the Ligurian names; it might conceivably be applied to the oldest known remains of Keltic, say the Keltic inscriptions of Gaul and Italy, but to nothing else. Of course, if by "proto-Keltic" something is meant so far different from Keltic as not to be recognizable as Keltic, then the entire argument is a dispute about names, and the name "proto-Keltic" is doubly unjustifiable and had better be dropped at once, and another name put in its place. Again the "proto-Kelts" of

Sergi or Childe,<sup>161</sup> who are concerned with archaeology, are just as much a phantasy, even on archaeological evidence, which has no place for them. Even if it had, their use of the term is fantastic, for "Keltic," we have already seen, has no meaning except as a linguistic term. Now granted that the Indo-European speech of Liguria, like that of Greece or of Italy, was preceded by a non-Indo-European form of speech, what name shall we give to it? The remains of non-Indo-European are just about as impressive in Liguria as in Greece. But the name Greek is usually reserved for the infinitely more impressive Indo-European remains, and, in Italy, the name Italic for the infinitely more impressive Osco-Umbrian and Latin-Faliscan; in like manner I maintain that the name Ligurian should be reserved for the infinitely more impressive Indo-European remains of Liguria — especially since linguistically they can be classified as intermediate between Italic and Keltic, but neither the one nor the other. If anyone wants a name for the non-Indo-European remains of Liguria, I advise him to call them precisely that — non-Indo-European, just as he does in Italy or in Greece, or if he prefers it, pre-Indo-European, since linguistically they can no more be further classified in Liguria than in Greece and Italy; and not to distort the linguistic situation and put it all out of proportion by taking the only geographical name that we have from the more important in order to attach it to the less important and almost negligible pre-Indo-European fragments of speech in Liguria. "Lepontic" as a geographical label remains unaffected by this discussion; so does the view (it is Pedersen's and Kretschmer's more than mine) that it is essentially Ligurian or Kelto-Ligurian in character.

(4) Ligurian, the term being used as determined above, must have been introduced by Indo-European speaking folks who linguistically were a link between the Keltic-speaking and the Italic-speaking people of the Italo-Keltic group of Indo-European. Italo-Keltic, as Pedersen has seen, thus receives a tripartite (not bipartite) subdivision. But we have no other name for them, any more than we have for the other tribes who introduced Indo-European speech into Italy or the tribes who introduced Indo-European speech into Turkestan. Their history is too remote for that. The name "proto-Kelts" as we have seen is ruled out. It would be ruled out, if there were no other reasons, solely by its implication that the people of Liguria spoke four different languages in succession within a thousand years, an implication that is patently absurd. But those who wish to use the name Ligurian for the non-Indo-European speech of Liguria (or, to use their misleading phraseology, who say that Ligurian was a non-Indo-European language) are the ones who must face and, if they can, answer at least two further questions squarely and honestly. They admit that an Indo-European language came to be spoken in Liguria. Who then, I ask them, introduced

<sup>161</sup> G. Sergi, *Italia: le origini*, 1919, 154, 322, 409; V. G. Childe, *Proc. Brit. Association*, 1926, 392.

it? Not "proto-Kelts," for there is no such thing; nor Keltic-speaking people, for it is not Keltic; nor Italic-speaking, for it is not Italic. Pokorny's "Illyrian" I have dealt with above. Who then? There is no answer other than the one I have given. Neither archaeology, nor history, nor language has any acceptable name to give to that Indo-European dialect better than, indeed other than, Ligurian. But when was it introduced? At a remote date, far more remote than any that can be assigned to the imaginary "proto-Kelts" of the archaeologists. For, as Pedersen has seen,<sup>162</sup> the period of Italo-Keltic unity probably reaches back well into the second millennium B.C., before which it can no longer be perceived. But it was only at the time when Italic and Keltic were developing independently that the intermediate Ligurian came into existence, for there is no indication of linguistic mixture, such as is found in Lepontic. Hence Pedersen's chronology seems to me to be sound.

## NOTE B (p. 27)

*On Venetic ECUPETARIS*

It may have been, as Pedersen declares,<sup>163</sup> "beschämend" (so I thought it at the time), that Conway kept Pauli's old transcription of the Venetic symbol  $\mathbf{||}$ , as everywhere to be written *h*. Loyalty to Conway's memory forbids me say more here about the several appeals which I made to him between 1924 and 1929, asking him to reconsider his theories of the value both of the symbol  $\mathbf{||}$  and of the Venetic medial puncts; and likewise loyalty to my collaborator forbade me depart then from his system of transcription, little as I approved of it.<sup>164</sup> But if the adjective used by Pedersen is applicable to any interpretation of *e-kupeθari-s-* that I have yet read, then it is to Pedersen's own:<sup>165</sup> "der erste Bestandteil gehört zu gr. *νέκυσ*, der zweite zu *πέτρᾱ*," for that requires us to believe that an initial *n-* had been lost in Venetic, or else added in *νέκυσ* (and, therefore, presumably in Latin *nex* and its congeners), and also to regard the vowel *a* as due to anaptyxis. His appeal to Hittite *aki* "dies" is not conclusive.

It would have been easier to swallow an appeal to Irish *ēc* "death" and to assume *eku-* beside *enku-* from *\*nku-* with a loss of *n* before *k* such as took place also in later Venetic before *t*, e.g. *vh[ou]χotna·i·* (PID no. 134) beside *vhō·u·χō·n·tna* (ib. no. 16), cf. *vhō·u·χōta* (ib. no. 136 bis v),<sup>166</sup> and *kuito* if

<sup>162</sup> H. Pedersen, *Linguistic Science in the Nineteenth Century*, 1931, 313, 319.

<sup>163</sup> Cf. n. 159 above.

<sup>164</sup> PID II 79, 511, 547; III 39 (s.v. *ritiei*); cf. *Classical Philology*, XXIX 1934, 283.

<sup>165</sup> Characterized as "poco persuasivo" even by the writer of an article in *Enc. Ital.* XXXV 1937, 47.

<sup>166</sup> Suppl. I, *Classical Philology*, XXIX 1934, 286.



rightly so read and interpreted as "Quintus." In this the development would be the same as in Old Irish, for *n* is regularly preserved before *k* and before *t* in Venetic, as in the oldest Keltic; but the assumption is unjustified without the occurrence of the older spelling *enk-*, especially in a document as old as the Venetic inscriptions *PID* nos. 141, 142, not to mention the fatal *p-* in *-petari·s·*, for the etymology of *πέτρᾱ* which connected it with *-quetro-* in Latin *triquetrus* is no longer accepted, and even Rhys stopped short of claiming Venetic for Keltic, just as Fraser has stopped short of claiming it (with Pauli's predecessors) for Etruscan.

As for the ending, it would be better to compare Ven. *kluthiari·s·*, which must have had an original *r*, since intervocalic *-s-* was preserved in Venetic. No one will deny that Latin *-arius* stands for an older *-asios* (both Oscan and Umbrian testify to *-s-*); and Latin *Clutorius*, *Clutorianus* contain *-tor-io-*, not *-aris*. Besides, Venetic shows no evidence that would lead us to suppose that it has nominatives in *-is* beside *-ios*, like Oscan (*Pakis*) and, in a few forms, dialectal Latin too (*Clodis*). Accordingly, in *·e·kupeθari·s·* it is necessary to see an I. Eu. *-ri-* form. Such forms do exist, even if they are not numerous. But we have not only the comparatively isolated formations such as Lat. *imber* (*imbris*), Osc. *anafriss*: Skt. *abhrā-m*, Lat. *uter* (*utris*): Gr. *ἄνυδρος*, *ὕδρα*, or Skt. *aśri-*, Gr. *ἄκρις*: *ἄκρος*, Lat. *ācer*, *ocris*, Osc. *akrid*, Lat. *sacer* (O.L. *sacres*, pl.), Osc. *sakrim*, Umb. *sacre*, with *-ri-* beside *-ro-*; <sup>167</sup> Lat. *puter*, *putris* (: *puteo*), Gr. *ἵδρις* (*ἰδεῖν*). Italic has also a widely spread *-aris* ending which is commonly supposed everywhere to stand for an older *-alis*, *-l-* being dissimilated to *-r-* when another *-l-* already stands in the word (e.g. *popularis*). If, however, Italic properly has only *-alis* and not *-aris* (Vestinian *flusare* but Latin *floralis*), then in some words at least *-aris* is secondary, for there is no cause for dissimilation in Osc. *dekkviarim*, Umb. *sehmeniar*; and, dissimilated or not, *-aris* appears in Osc. *luisarifs*, which has the same phonetic complex as *flusare*. But if Osco-Umbrian has a secondary *-aris*, why should not Venetic also show it? And derivatives with *-r-*, from various sources, do make their appearance in more than one Indo-European language in forms that cannot contain an older *-s-* like Latin *-arius*, for example Greek *-αριον* in diminutives, Germanic *-(u)ario-* in ethnic names, or (obviously from *\*bher-*) O.H.G. adjectives in *-bāri*.

There is, however, at hand a very simple way of accounting for Venetic *-petari·s·*, without appealing to Greek *πέτρᾱ*, *πετρι-* (cf. *πέτρινος*), an appeal that has involved Pedersen in the assumption of a Venetic anaptyxis (why not metathesis?) otherwise entirely unknown. For, side by side with the verbal derivatives *ἵδρις* and *putris* cited above, we have *r-*derivatives from the root of Latin *peto* (*pet-*, *petā-*, *pet-*, with an old *r/n* stem *\*pētr̥*, *\*petnēs*)<sup>168</sup>

<sup>167</sup> Brugmann, *Grundriss* ed. 2, II 1 (1906), 381–384. Cf. M. Leumann and J. B. Hofmann, *Lat. Gram.*, 1926 (1928), 233, 238. On Lat. *-alis* (∞ Etr. *-al*) G. Herbig, *Glotta* IV 1912–13, 186. Cf. O.L. *sacris*, *pac(a)ri*.

<sup>168</sup> Walde-Pokorny, *Wtb.* II 1927, 19–21; cf. I 1930, 172.



in Skt. *patará-*, *patáru-* and perhaps in Greek *πτέρις* (-εως, acc. *πτέριν*, pl. *πτέρεις*, beside gen. *πτέριδος*); the alternation -ro-: -ru-: -ri- is normal, and the assumption of anaptyxis totally unnecessary (cf. Skt. *patará-* *patáru-*),<sup>169</sup> even if we take the final step of comparing the compound *acci-piter*, older *\*acu-petri-s*<sup>170</sup> (cf. Gr. *ὠκύπτερος*, *ὠκυπέτης*, Skt. *aśupátvan-*, *aśupátvā*). For this very word gives us not only an old Latin genitive *accipiteris*<sup>171</sup> "apud uetustissimos," but also a by-form *acceptor* (with its derivative in -arius), said to have been used by Lucilius (fr. 1130);<sup>172</sup> and, last of all, if we may trust the testimony of Placidus<sup>173</sup> *accipitres: equos celeres*, a shadow of the literal meaning of *accipiter* "swift-flying" still lurked in the Latin *Accipiter*, even if "Hawk" was merely the name of a swift race-horse (like *Aquila*, *Tigris*).

But "swift-flying" would be a good nick-name for a jockey or charioteer as well as a good name for a race-horse. A possible ablaut-variant of *\*ōkū-* "swift" is *\*ēkū-*, and it is preferable to see even that in Venetic *e·kupeθari·s·* rather than Pedersen's (n)eku- "corpse," if, despite the Pannonian name *Ecco* and Latin *eculus*, *eculeus*, *ecus* (*equōs*), we may not assume a Venetic *eku-* for an older *\*ēkūo-*; for one of the three inscriptions which bear the word *e·kupeθari·s·*, *ecupētaris* shows us a horseman driving his two-horse chariot (PID no. 142), and if Pedersen objects that another (no. 141) does not, then I must insist that a bronze urn, the object on which the third was engraved (no. 157a), can not conceivably be described as a "grave-stone," which is Pedersen's interpretation of the word! Finally, the Keltic compound *eporedias* "bonos equorum domitores" makes a satisfactory parallel to the formation of *e·ku-peθari·s·*.<sup>174</sup>

#### NOTE C (p. 28)

##### *On Polybius II 35.4*

If it were worth while, which it is not, either on his account or on mine, to confute one by one the several mis-statements in which Mr Robson has indulged himself,<sup>175</sup> it would be an easy matter to do so. Two examples must

<sup>169</sup> Brugmann, *Grundriss* ed. 2, II i (1906), 355-356.

<sup>170</sup> Cf. Walde-Hofmann, *Lat. etym. Wtb.*, ed. 3, 1930, 6.

<sup>171</sup> Priscian, *Gr. Lat.* II 229.7 (Keil).

<sup>172</sup> Charisius, *Gr. Lat.* I 98.9 (Keil).

<sup>173</sup> *Glossaria Latina* IV (1930), 13 no. 42 (= *CGL* V 516).

<sup>174</sup> It should be recalled that Conway's interpretation was actually not his, but Torp's in the first place; *e·kupeθari·s·* is conceivably a proper name; if so, compare *Assedomarus*, *Aθedomarus* beside *assidarius*, *essedarius*.

<sup>175</sup> *CW* XXXI 1938, 85-86.

suffice, for his merely subjective judgements are of no importance either way, any more than his complaint that I have not included in my *Foundations of Roman Italy* whatever I judged to be irrelevant to its subject, as the rape of the Sabine women and such like old wives' tales; but it is of some importance not to let pass unchallenged the extraordinary and false assertion that of the Indo-European-speaking tribes who migrated into Italy "no others are mentioned" than the Samnites.

Mr Robson exaggerates. I do not profess to mention by name so many even as *one* people in "the migration of Indo-European speaking tribes into Italy;" but if he can count, Mr Robson will find half-a-dozen and more names of tribes, the Samnites among them, who lived in Italy in historical times and spoke Indo-European languages, which is a very different thing. Mr Robson's real grievance, as a glance at his reference told me, is that I decline to accept his ill-founded theory of a migration from Samnium to the valley of the Po, which he supposes to have taken place at the end of the Second Punic War, but which neither Polybius nor any other historian has perjured himself into witnessing. I profess to mention such names, just as I profess to set forth the precise manner of the establishment of the Indo-European languages in Italy, *not at all*, inasmuch as I confess myself ignorant, like everybody else except Mr Robson, of those things. Had I been writing a work of fiction, of the kind of Mr Robson's thesis, nothing would have been easier than to make precise, but imaginary, what is now left vague in order that it may also be both accurate and honest.

However, if you must have an imaginary migration of Samnites into the Po valley, you must first extirpate the previous inhabitants in order to make room for the new-comers. What Mr Robson calls a mistaken assumption is neither mistaken nor an assumption. I observe with pleasure Mr Robson's epigraphic leanings. Well, there are literally hundreds of inscribed grave-stones of men, women, and children, who were born, lived, died, and were buried, in Cisalpine Gaul, in the centuries after Polybius, and who bore names that can be nothing else but Keltic <sup>176</sup> — and that was knowledge even before Holder had collected them. It is a choice, therefore, between the strait literalism of an only too "precise statement" of an ancient author and an overwhelming combination of interpretative and yet historical though not literary testimony. Of course, you can have the *uox* of Polybius, *et praeterea nihil*, and conveniently empty the Po if you like, but then you will have an ancient error, which Nissen saw through long before the archaeological and linguistic research of this present century gave us the only interpretation of Polybius' exaggerated assertion that can save it from outright rejection as being either a blunder or a fabrication, and reconcile it with the evidence of later writers, for example of Strabo (V 1.6) that Insubres still survived in his day in the vicinity of Milan, which Strabo, almost in the

<sup>176</sup> Cf. G. E. F. Chilver, *Cisalpine Gaul*, 1941, 81-83, who makes the same point against Robson, and who also interprets Polybius as I do.

words of Polybius, describes as being near the Alps! As Mommsen rightly saw, "Mediolanum and Brixia were indebted for their wide bounds and their lasting power essentially to the fact that they were, properly speaking, nothing but the cantons of the Insubres and the Cenomani."<sup>177</sup>

Polybius meant that the Kelts "were expelled" from Cisalpine Gaul in the sense in which Strabo (V 4.8) meant that the Samnites "were ejected" (ἐξέπεσον) from Pompeii, namely from any political control or autonomy — for their language also and their family names endured in Campania for centuries after the "ejection." Similarly von Duhn, speaking on archaeological grounds, has insisted:<sup>178</sup> "Die Bemerkung des Polybius (II 35.4), schon zu seiner Zeit, um 150, seien die Gallier bis an den Fuss des Gebirges hinaufgedrängt darf nicht mit Niese im Sinne gänzlicher Ausmerzungen im übrigen Po-Land, sondern nur als Aufhören ihrer politischen Beherrschung der Po-Ebene verstanden werden"; and again a recent writer in the *Cambridge Ancient History*,<sup>179</sup> declares, quite rightly, that "even in Italy we can perceive beneath the crust of romanization something of the Keltic tradition in the North." If the Etruscans and Gauls lived side by side (Polyb. II 17), why not the Gauls and the Romans?

The argument based on the paucity of Keltic inscriptions, if it were valid, would prove that the Keltic-speaking people of Gaul itself were almost exterminated by the Romans. In fact, it only shows that they learned to talk Latin almost everywhere in Gaul, as in Italy, before they learnt to write. Long after the days of Polybius, Cisalpina was still Gallia; are we then to be told that the people of England are no longer English?

Much recent study, for example the paper of Vittorio Bertoldi in *Vox Romanica*,<sup>180</sup> goes to show that much more of Keltic survived in North Italy than we have hitherto supposed. And the language of the Lepontic inscriptions likewise can only be explained by the assumption of profound Keltic influence upon the Ligurian substratum. As for names in *Sab-* Pokorny also has observed that in Cisalpine Gaul they by no means imply a migration from central Italy.<sup>181</sup>

So my second is a much more serious objection altogether. The familiar method of omission is easily the most deadly way of practising the art of misrepresentation. Twice Mr Robson deliberately suppresses some words in the sentences which he quotes from me. The suppression of the words

<sup>177</sup> *Provinces of the Roman Empire*, Eng. tr. by W. P. Dickson, new edition, 1909, I 55.

<sup>178</sup> Ebert, *Reallexikon* VI 1925, 287.

<sup>179</sup> XI 1936, 803.

<sup>180</sup> III 1938, 229-236; cf. G. Alessio, "Il nome del fiume Savuto ed una nuova base mediterranea \*Sap-, \*Sab-," in *L'Italia Antichissima*, N. S. fasc. XI, 1937, 53-59.

<sup>181</sup> *ZfCPH* XXI 1938, 79-80.

"or extinct" (p. 153) is tantamount to a *suppressio veri* calculated to deceive; and by omitting the words "the point is not pressed" (p. 182), he contrives to throw into the eyes of his readers the very dustiest dust of the whole silly dispute about Vergil's birthplace and ancestry, and at the same time to mis-represent my position.





# PRINCIPLES OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM KNOWN TO ST. JEROME \*

BY KARL KELCHNER HULLEY

WHEN St. Jerome was commissioned by Pope Damasus to revise the Latin text of the four Gospels,<sup>1</sup> he undertook a task which terminated ultimately in the Vulgate edition of the Bible. The actual extent of Jerome's contribution to this monumental edition has been questioned by some;<sup>2</sup> his work, nevertheless, has earned for him a place of special prominence among the scholars who have devoted themselves to the criticism of Biblical texts. Hence it is but natural to presume that among the qualifications which he possessed for his undertaking, knowledge of the principles of textual criticism must have been of prime importance. But just what his knowledge of the critic's art was might well remain obscure, were it not for the fact that in his various writings he frequently mentions one or another principle of this art. In this paper, therefore, it is my purpose to bring together from his own statements such information as may present at least a

\* The material presented in this paper is drawn primarily from my doctoral dissertation, written under the direction of Professor A. S. Pease. To him I am indebted for the suggestion of the subject, for much helpful advice, and for the references to the works of St. Augustine and Cassiodorus cited herein. Compare also my previous article, "Light cast by St. Jerome on certain palaeographical Points," *Harv. Stud. in Cl. Philol.* LIV (1943), 83-92.

<sup>1</sup> *Praefat. in Quat. Evang.* (PL XXIX 526). References to the works of Jerome are cited from the following editions: I. Hilberg, *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae*: CSEL LIV-LVI (Vienna and Leipzig, 1910-1918); G. Morin, *Anecdota Maredsolana*, III, parts 1-3 (Maredsous and Oxford, 1895-1903); S. Reiter, *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi in Hieremiam Prophetam Libri sex*: CSEL LIX (Vienna and Leipzig, 1913); E. C. Richardson, *Hieronymus, Liber de Viris Illustribus* (Leipzig, 1896); for works of Jerome not included in the editions mentioned above: J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, XXIII-XXIX (Paris, 1845-1846, following the second edition of D. Vallarsi, 1766-1772 — hereinafter abbreviated as V.).

<sup>2</sup> E.g., F. Cavallera, "Saint Jérôme et la Vulgate des Actes des Épîtres et de l'Apocalypse": *BLE*, III<sup>e</sup> Serie, XXI (1920), 269-292. Cf. G. Grützmacher, *Hieronymus*, II (Berlin, 1906), pp. 94-96 and 270.

reasonably comprehensive view of his critical method and procedure.

At the outset, a few points should perhaps be mentioned which indicate his attitude toward his critical work as it is revealed in his replies to various persons who, being opposed to him and his work, asserted that he was attacking the translators of the Septuagint version,<sup>3</sup> and accused him of forgery<sup>4</sup> and sacrilege in venturing to criticize the inspired Word of God.<sup>5</sup> Jerome's responses to the first two of these charges make clear his conviction that owing to the chaotic condition of the texts of the Bible there was a crying need of a standard text which might have the stamp of authority.<sup>6</sup> When speaking of the Old Testament, he remarks that virtually every locality has its own version, whereas the ancient and genuine translation has become corrupt;<sup>7</sup> and, again, he mentions three different lines of text tradition, each resting on different authority and holding a position of preference in a particular area.<sup>8</sup> Similarly, in referring to the New Testament, he indicates an almost endless variety of textual readings, for in a reply to his detractors he writes: "Si enim Latinis exemplaribus fides adhibenda est, respondeant quibus: tot enim sunt exemplaria paene quot codices."<sup>9</sup>

His answer to the charge of sacrilege, though it affirms his own acceptance of the Bible as the inspired Word of God, voices his belief that in the transmission of the text errors have arisen, as proved by the existence of variant readings, and that it is the critic's business by removing these errors to establish a trustworthy text.<sup>10</sup> The errors to which he refers fall into three categories: namely, errors of translation;<sup>11</sup> errors caused by ill-judged attempts at textual emendation;<sup>12</sup>

<sup>3</sup> *Praefat. in Lib. Iob* (PL XXIX 1079).

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.* (PL XIX 61); *Praefat. in Quat. Evang.* (PL XXIX 526).

<sup>5</sup> *Loc. cit. ult.*; *Ep.* 27. 1, 1-2.

<sup>6</sup> *Praefat. in Lib. Ios.* (PL XXVIII 463). Cf. *Praefat. in Lib. Iob* (PL XXVIII 1082); *Ep.* 27. 1, 2; 112. 20, 4.

<sup>7</sup> *Praefat. in Lib. Paralip.* (PL XXVIII 1324).

<sup>8</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>9</sup> *Praefat. in Quat. Evang.* (PL XXIX 526). Cf. *Praefat. in Lib. Ios.* (PL XXVIII 463).

<sup>10</sup> *Ep.* 27. 1, 1-2. Cf. *Aug. Ep.* 116, 3 (in the letters of Jerome).

<sup>11</sup> *Praefat. in Quat. Evang.* (PL XXIX 527).

<sup>12</sup> *Loc. cit.* Cf. *Praefat. in Lib. Ios.* (PL XXVIII 463).

errors made by careless or incompetent copyists.<sup>13</sup> The first of these categories, since it has little to do with the subject of this paper, may be omitted here, though some use will be made of it as evidence later in the discussion of specific errors. Of the second, Jerome observes that emendations ignorantly attempted, far from correcting errors, result only in added confusion of the text.<sup>14</sup> Of the third, he writes that many faulty readings are to be attributed to copyists, for they do not pay attention to their work and even go to sleep over it,<sup>15</sup> or they carelessly change the readings of a text, writing not what they find before them but what they understand.<sup>16</sup> Furthermore, that errors thus caused were likely to be transmitted in subsequent copying over a period of time, he was fully aware.<sup>17</sup>

## I. LOWER CRITICISM

### A. THE ESTABLISHING OF THE TEXT

To pass on to the details of criticism, lower and higher, known to Jerome, I shall begin with those which have to do with the establishing of a text.<sup>18</sup> Relevant to this part of a critic's procedure, there are four points which the statements of Jerome seem to indicate. First, the importance of the title of a work. Jerome regarded the title as an important part of the work to which it belonged, for it contained such essential information as the author's name,<sup>19</sup> the nature of the subject matter,<sup>20</sup> and, if the work was divided into books, the number of the

<sup>13</sup> *Ep.* 71. 5, 2.

<sup>14</sup> *Loc. cit.*; *Tract. in Psalm.* 77 (*Anec. Mared.* III. 2, p. 60); *Praefat. in Quat. Evang.* (PL XXIX 528).

<sup>15</sup> *Praefat. in Quat. Evang.* (PL XXIX 527); *Ep.* 106. 30, 3.

<sup>16</sup> *Ep.* 71. 5, 2. For urgent requests that copying be done exactly, see *Praefat. in Esdr.* (PL XXVIII 1403); *Vir. Illust.* 35; *Ep.* 80. 3, 2.

<sup>17</sup> *In Ezech.* XII (PL XXV 376; V. 470); *id.* XII (PL XXV 381; V. 476); *Praefat. in Lib. Paralip.* (PL XXIX 402).

<sup>18</sup> In arranging my material from this point on, I have followed the order of T. Birt, *Kritik u. Hermeneutik*: Müller, *Handb. d. klass. Altertumswiss.* I, part 3<sup>3</sup> (Munich, 1913).

<sup>19</sup> *Adv. Rufin.* II 19 (PL XXIII 444; V. 513); II 23 (PL XXIII 447; V. 517).

<sup>20</sup> *In Hab.* I, *Praefat.* (PL XXV 1273; V. 587 sq.). Cf. *Ep.* 112. 3, where Jerome explains to Augustine the title of his work *De Viris Illustribus*.



particular book to which it belonged.<sup>21</sup> In books made up of a collection of short poems, such as the book of *Psalms*, the separate poems might have individual titles serving a purpose similar to that of the titles of longer works.<sup>22</sup> It seems reasonable to presume, therefore, that Jerome thought of the title as something to be carefully transcribed by copyists.<sup>23</sup> He recognized the fact, however, that some works might not have a title,<sup>24</sup> and that occasionally a title might be added without authority, as was done in the case of certain psalms which, though lacking inscriptions in the Hebrew text, had been given titles in the translations.<sup>25</sup> Such titles he regarded as spurious.<sup>26</sup>

Second, the collation of textual readings. The evidence pointing to Jerome's knowledge of collation as a part of critical procedure must be considered with due regard for the nature of his works in which most of it occurs — commentaries and letters, in which he is concerned primarily with the readings of Biblical texts in translation rather than with the readings of various copies of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament or of the Greek text of the New Testament. Hence by far the greater part of the evidence is contained in his citation of readings drawn from different translations for the purpose of comparison with the text of the original.<sup>27</sup> Such a procedure is only suggestive of collation in a technical sense; yet because of the similarity of the method involved, some weight may be given to it as evidence, especially when the authenticity of the translation is judged by the comparison with the original. For Jerome frequently rejects readings in translation

<sup>21</sup> In *Ezech. V Praefat.* (PL XXV 140 sq.; V. 163 sq.).

<sup>22</sup> *Tract. in Psalm. 5* (*Anec. Mared. III. 2*, p. 10); *Tract. in Psalm. 7* (*Anec. Mared. III. 2*, p. 17); *Praefat. in Lib. Psalm.* (PL XXVIII 1123).

<sup>23</sup> In *Ep. 73. 1, 1*, he notes that the author's name is missing from the title of a work which was sent to him; in *Ep. 112. 3*, where he replies to Augustine's statement that a work of Jerome's had reached him without a title, he states the correct title and then remarks that it seems to have been changed by some "ignorant emendators."

<sup>24</sup> In *Mal.* (PL XXV 1542; V. 941 sq.).

<sup>25</sup> *Tract. in Psalm. 90* (*Anec. Mared. III 3*, p. 67); *Ep. 140. 2, 5*.

<sup>26</sup> *Ll. cc.*

<sup>27</sup> E.g., In *Os. II* (PL XXV 897; V. 77); *Quaest. Hebr. in Gen.* (PL XXIII 937; V. 305). Additional examples occur in the works of Jerome, *passim*. For his statement of his method, see *Ep. 106. 2, 3*.

because they lack the authority of the original,<sup>28</sup> and he produced an edition of the book of *Job* and of the *Psalms* in which all passages of the Septuagint version not supported by the Hebrew text were marked with the *obelus*, the symbol of rejection.<sup>29</sup>

It is also significant that he exhibits a familiarity with different Biblical texts, both Hebrew and Greek. He owned a copy of Origen's *Hexapla*, which he had corrected for himself according to the authentic text;<sup>30</sup> he had copied certain Hebrew texts brought to him from a Jewish synagogue by a friend;<sup>31</sup> he speaks of certain others which he used as those which the Jews considered authentic,<sup>32</sup> though he realized that the Hebrew texts available to him might not be identical in their readings with those used by the Septuagint translators.<sup>33</sup> Of the Greek texts of the New Testament known to him, he refers to the following: an edition by Origen;<sup>34</sup> an edition attributed to Lucian and Hesychius;<sup>35</sup> certain other texts which he designates simply as "old."<sup>36</sup> It is to the latter that he refers when he writes of his translation of the four Gospels: "Igitur haec praesens praefatiuncula pollicetur quattuor tantum evangelia . . . codicum Graecorum emendata collatione, sed veterum."<sup>37</sup>

The evidence thus far presented as indicative that Jerome was familiar with the procedure of collating textual readings is confirmed by certain passages which, though relatively few, contain citations of

<sup>28</sup> E.g., *In Is.* XIV (PL XXIV 487; V. 591); *In Ezech.* XIII (PL XXV 407; V. 509).

<sup>29</sup> *Praefat. in Lib. Iob* (PL XXIX 62); *Praefat. in Lib. Psalm.* (PL XXIX 119). Cf. *Lib. Dan.* (PL XXVIII 1299); *Lib. Esth.* (PL XXVIII 1445).

<sup>30</sup> *In Tit.* (PL XXVI 595; V. 734).

<sup>31</sup> *Ep.* 36. 1, 2.

<sup>32</sup> *Adv. Rufin.* III 25 (PL XXIII 476; V. 555).

<sup>33</sup> *In Gal.* II (PL XXVI 357; V. 431); *id.* II (PL XXVI 363; V. 437). Cavallera ("Saint Jérôme et la Bible": BLE, III<sup>e</sup> Serie, XXII (1921), 214-227) seems not to take account of these passages when he states (p. 222) that Jerome did not realize that the readings of the texts used by the Septuagint translators might be different from those of his texts.

<sup>34</sup> *In Matth.* IV (PL XXVI 181; V. 199); *In Gal.* I (PL XXVI 348; V. 418).

<sup>35</sup> *Praefat. in Quat. Evang.* (PL XXIX 527).

<sup>36</sup> *Op. cit.* (PL XXIX 528).

<sup>37</sup> *Loc. cit.* Cf. Cassiod. *Inst.* I. *Praefat.* 8; Aug. *Doctr. Chr.* II 17 and 21, where the value of collation is emphasized.

genuine textual variants. One, which is perhaps unique, points out a difference of reading in the Hebrew texts of the Old Testament;<sup>38</sup> the others deal with variants in the Greek texts of the New Testament, of which the following may be cited as typical: two variants in the text of *Corinthians* I;<sup>39</sup> one in the text of *Galatians*;<sup>40</sup> one in the Greek translation of *Hosea*.<sup>41</sup> Jerome's citation of variants, moreover, is usually accompanied by a discussion in which he states his opinion as to which is the correct reading. Judgments of this sort are based on such considerations as the appropriateness of a word to its context<sup>42</sup> or the appropriateness of a form, such as the person of a verb.<sup>43</sup> The weight of support of other MSS. is also taken into account, apparently, but is not necessarily the determining point.<sup>44</sup>

Third, the evaluation of manuscripts. It is clear from the remarks of Jerome that he did not consider all MSS. of equal value, but attached considerable weight to the readings of old ones, realizing that as copies were multiplied in the course of time errors tended to in-

<sup>38</sup> *In Hab.* I (PL XXV 1306; V. 630): "Propterea sciendum in quibusdam Hebraicis voluminibus non esse additum 'omnis' sed absolute 'spiritus' legi."

<sup>39</sup> *Ep.* 119. 2-7, where the readings "omnes quidem dormiemus, non autem omnes inmutabimur" and "non omnes dormiemus, omnes autem inmutabimur" are cited and discussed; for, as he says, "utrumque in Graecis codicibus invenitur." *Id.* 5. 4, where the readings  $\rho\sigma\tau\eta$  and  $\rho\iota\tau\eta$  are discussed.

<sup>40</sup> *In Gal.* III (PL XXVI 425; V. 517), where the readings  $\kappa\alpha\upsilon\theta\eta\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  and  $\kappa\alpha\upsilon\chi\eta\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  are cited. Cf. *id.* III (PL XXVI 401; V. 487). Evidence of this sort seems to be disregarded by Cavallera ("Saint Jérôme et la Bible": BLE, III<sup>e</sup> Serie, XXII (1921), 265-284), when he remarks in his discussion of Jerome's commentaries on four of the *Epistles* of Paul, including the *Epistle to the Galatians*, that Jerome cites no variants in the Greek text.

<sup>41</sup> *In Os.* I (PL XXV 829; V. 12): "Pro  $\omicron\upsilon\kappa$   $\eta\lambda\epsilon\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$  . . . in quibusdam fertur exemplaribus  $\omicron\upsilon\kappa$   $\eta\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$  . . ." Cf. *id.* II (PL XXV 879; V. 78).

<sup>42</sup> *In Os.* I (PL XXV 829; V. 12).

<sup>43</sup> *Ep.* 106. 65, 4.

<sup>44</sup> When Jerome, in his discussion of the variants cited in n. 41, virtually condemns the reading found "in quibusdam . . . exemplaribus," it seems reasonable to presume that the reading which he accepts is supported by the majority of MSS. In *Ep.* 119. 2-7, however, he rejects a reading that is supported "plerisque codicibus" and accepts the one which seems to him consistent with the context of the whole passage. Cf. the view of Eusebius as given in Hieron. *Chron. a. Abr.* (*Praefat. Euseb.*), PL XXVII 44: ". . . sequendumque illud potius, quod exemplariorum multitudo in fidem traxit." Similar is the view stated by Augustine. *c. Faust.* XI 2.

crease.<sup>45</sup> It may be inferred, however, that apart from age, he gave due consideration to the reliability of well-written and carefully corrected MSS.<sup>46</sup> Further, his critical evaluations were extended to editions, such as the Koinè edition of the Old Testament<sup>47</sup> and the edition of the New Testament attributed to Lucian and Hesychius,<sup>48</sup> both of which he regarded as inferior.

Fourth, the importance of *testimonia*. That quotations found in the works of an author are of value in determining the correct reading of the source from which they are drawn was recognized by Jerome, who on different occasions uses such evidence in his criticism of textual readings.<sup>49</sup> At the same time he was aware that, since quotations might be made from memory or might reproduce the thought only and not the actual words of the original passage,<sup>50</sup> they must be used for the purpose of criticism with due caution. It should be observed, too, that he made it a habit to compare all quotations of the Old Testament which he found in the New Testament with the readings of what he terms the original books.<sup>51</sup>

## B. TEXTUAL ERRORS AND THEIR CAUSES

In his many discussions of textual readings, Jerome exhibits a degree of caution and restraint such as should characterize the work of a competent critic. For although convinced of the necessity of cor-

<sup>45</sup> *In Gal.* III (PL XXVI 401; V. 488); *Praefat. in Quat. Evang.* (PL XXIX 528); and passages cited in n. 17. Cf. Cassiod. *Inst.* I. *Praefat.* 8; Aug. *c. Faust.* XI 2.

<sup>46</sup> *In Is.* XVI (PL XXIV 570; V. 696): "... sed ne in Septuaginta quidem emendatis et veris exemplaribus. . ."

<sup>47</sup> *Ep.* 106. 2, 4.

<sup>48</sup> *Praefat. in Quat. Evang.* (PL XXIX 527).

<sup>49</sup> *In Psalm.* 21 (*Anec. Mared.* III. 1, p. 33); *In Is.* XV (PL XXIV 513; V. 625 sq.); *In Os.* III (PL XXV 915; V. 123). It is noteworthy that in *Comm. in Gal.* II (PL XXVI 357; V. 431), on the evidence of one of Paul's quotations of the Old Testament, he argues that the Hebrew text was altered after Paul's time. Cf. *id.* II (PL XXVI 360 sqq.; V. 435 sqq.).

<sup>50</sup> *In Mich.* II (PL XXV 1197; V. 489): "... evangelistis non ex libro carpentibus testimonia, sed memoriae credentibus, quae nonnumquam fallitur." *In Is.* III (PL XXIV 109; V. 110): "In multis testimoniis quae evangelistae vel apostoli de libris veteribus assumpserunt, curiosius attendendum est non eos verborum ordinem secutos esse sed sensum."

<sup>51</sup> *In Gal.* II (PL XXVI 537; V. 430).



recting errors, he did not overlook the fact that an ill-judged attempt at emendation might introduce an error where none had existed before. Hence at times he cautions others against an unjustified presumption of error in the readings of a text.<sup>52</sup> Yet in the course of his critical remarks he points out, in addition to a number of errors for which he offers no explanation, some thirteen types of faulty readings which he attributes to specific causes. The evidence, therefore, pointing to Jerome's knowledge of the causes of error I wish to present next. First, however, it should be explained that this evidence is derived at times from his comments on the work of translators rather than of copyists who were transcribing a text. Nevertheless, on the presumption that faulty translation arising from a misreading of a text involves the same causes which result in a copyist's errors of transcription, it seems that such evidence may be regarded as valid.

#### I. FAULTY WORD-DIVISION

Since it seems that in Jerome's time the separating of words in texts was little practiced,<sup>53</sup> it is only natural that he should refer to copyists' errors of word-division rarely. In fact, it appears that only once does a statement of his imply that copyists may be responsible for this sort of mistake.<sup>54</sup> Frequent references, however, to faulty translations which have resulted from the erroneous division of words as read in the Hebrew texts by the translators of the Old Testament indicate that Jerome realized the importance of correct word-division.<sup>55</sup>

#### 2. FAULTY ACCENTUATION

The evidence for Jerome's knowledge of errors involving a faulty accentuation of words is very slight. The use of the signs for the ac-

<sup>52</sup> *In Is.* V (PL XXIV 170; V. 188); *Epp.* 65. 11, 1; 73. 8, 2. Cf. *Ep.* 120. 3. *Comm. in Nah.* (PL XXV 1263; V. 574); *Comm. in Matth.* IV (PL XXVI 191; V. 212).

<sup>53</sup> L. Havet, *Manuel de critique verbale* (Paris, 1911), p. 167, sec. 662; Birt, *Krit. u. Hermen.*, p. 125. But cf. W. Schubart, *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1921), p. 80.

<sup>54</sup> *Praefat. in Lib. Esdr.* (PL XXVIII, 1403): "... admonentes ut Hebraea nomina . . . distincte et per intervalla transcribant." Cf. *Praefat. in Lib. Paralip.* (PL XXIX 402).

<sup>55</sup> *In Mich.* II (PL XXV 1124; V. 523); *In Zach.* III (PL XXV 1504; V. 890). Other examples occur in Jerome's commentaries, *passim*.

cents seems to have been quite limited in his time,<sup>56</sup> though a freer use of them in the MSS. of an earlier period<sup>57</sup> may well have been known to him. At all events, even though he seems not to suggest anywhere that copyists make errors of accentuation, he discusses in at least three passages the importance of Hebrew accentuation in the determination of the meaning of words.<sup>58</sup>

### 3. FAULTY PUNCTUATION

Frequent references made by Jerome to the effect of punctuation on the sense of a passage indicate his familiarity with this source of textual errors.<sup>59</sup> In discussing questions of punctuation, he often exhibits a willingness to expound a passage according to the punctuation familiar to his readers; yet he also points out what he regards as the preferable punctuation and suggests that the evidence of the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Old and New Testaments respectively should be carefully observed.<sup>60</sup>

### 4. CONFUSION OF NUMBER-SIGNS

An interesting example of an error caused by the confusion of numerical symbols occurs in Jerome's explanation of the reason why Mark

<sup>56</sup> Schubart, *op. cit.* 136.

<sup>57</sup> Schubart, *loc. cit.* and p. 84. In *Monogr. (Anec. Mared.* III. 3, p. 195) Jerome refers to accent-signs: "Intuere ergo in ea .ι. recte stantem, et acutum transversum et in dexteram ascendentem, gravemque descendentem trans .ι. et acutum. De hiis ut sunt accentibus. . ."

<sup>58</sup> In *Is.* XVIII (PL XXIV 642; V. 786); In *Ezech.* VIII (PL XXV 258; V. 316); In *Am.* III (PL XXV 1085; V. 344). Cf. Augustine's remarks (*Ep.* 149. 4) on Greek accentuation.

<sup>59</sup> *Quaest. Hebr. in Gen.* (PL XXIII 943; V. 310); In *Mich.* I (PL XXV 1164; V. 447); *Tract. in Psalm.* 89 (*Anec. Mared.* III. 2, p. 107); *Ep.* 140. 6. Additional examples occur in his works, *passim*. It is significant that Jerome (*Ep.* 80. 3, 2) quotes the following words of Rufinus: "Illud sane omnem, qui hos libros vel descripturus est vel lecturus . . . contestor . . . ne addat aliquid huic scripturae . . . sed conferat cum exemplaribus . . . et distinguat et inemendatum vel non distinctum codicem non habeat, ne sensuum difficultas, si distinctus codex non sit, maiores obscuritates legentibus generet." Cf. Cassiod. *Inst.* I. 15, 12; Havet, *op. cit.* 113, sec. 387.

<sup>60</sup> In *Abd.* (PL XXV 1106; V. 371); In *Gal.* III (PL XXVI 428; V. 522); In *Eph.* I (PL XXVI 453; V. 555); In *Os.* I (PL XXV 847; V. 35); In *Tit.* (PL XXVI 585; V. 722). Cf. Aug. *Enarr. in Psalm.* 67. 41.

seems to disagree with Matthew and John in his record of the hour when Christ was crucified. Here he lays the blame for the discrepancy in the record upon the copyists whose confusion of the number-signs  $\varsigma'$  and  $\gamma'$  caused an error in the text; for he writes, "Error scriptorum fuit: et in Marco hora sexta scriptum fuit, sed multi pro ἐπισήμῳ Graeco putaverunt esse gamma."<sup>61</sup>

## 5. CONFUSION OF SIMILAR LETTERS

Of all the errors discussed by Jerome, those which are caused by the confusion of similar letters are perhaps most commonly mentioned. Yet the great majority of examples to be found in his writings illustrate a confusion of Hebrew letters by the translators of the Old Testament. He frequently speaks of the confusion of the letters *resh* and *daleth*, which are distinguished only by a small apex,<sup>62</sup> and of the letters *yod* and *vau*, which differ only in size.<sup>63</sup> It may be observed further that his comments indicate a confusion of sight rather than of sound; the latter, to my knowledge, he does not allude to clearly at any time.<sup>64</sup> Furthermore he nowhere, so far as I have found, refers to the confusion of Latin letters; and only occasionally does he indicate a confusion of Greek letters, as, for example, when he criticizes copyists for writing Δ instead of Α and Ω instead of Ο.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>61</sup> *Tract. in Psalm. 77* (*Anec. Mared. III. 2*, p. 60). Jerome seems here to use the word ἐπισήμῳ in the specific sense of "the sign for the number six" — a meaning not given by Liddell, Scott, and Jones. Cf., however, *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, s.v. *episemon*: "... nota numeri senarii q. e.  $\varsigma'$  . . . ."

<sup>62</sup> *In Is. XII* (*PL XXIV* 440; V. 531) and in other commentaries, *passim*.

<sup>63</sup> *Quaest. Hebr. in Gen.* (*PL XXIII* 997; V. 366) and in other works *passim*. Confusion of other Hebrew letters is noted at times: e.g., *beth* and *caph* (*In Psalm. 51* (*Anec. Mared. III. 1*, p. 50)); *zayin* and *vau* (*In Am. III.* (*PL XXV* 1069; V. 324)).

<sup>64</sup> A possible hint may be seen in his discussion of variants in *Psalm 89* (*Ep. 106. 16, 4*): "Ubi nos interpretati sumus: 'eruditos . . .' alii transtulerunt 'compeditos' verbi ambiguitate decepti. Si enim dicas πεπεδημένους, 'compeditos' significet." Perhaps the other reading was πεπαυμένους. Augustine (*Enarr. in Psalm. 89. 13*) comments on the same variants and says they were similar in sound, but he does not give the Greek readings.

<sup>65</sup> *In Hier. V* 66. 6; *Tract. in Psalm. 131* (*Anec. Mared. III. 2*, p. 244). The confusion of Θ and Χ is suggested in *Comm. in Psalm. 131* (*Anec. Mared. III. 1*, p. 90) and *Comm. in Gal. III* (*PL XXVI* 425; V. 518).

## 6. CONFUSION OF ABBREVIATIONS

Specific examples of errors caused by a misunderstanding of abbreviations seem not to be cited by Jerome. Yet he shows that he was aware of this source of error, both on the part of a person dictating material to be written by a copyist and on the part of a copyist reading for himself the material to be copied, when he says that serious errors were introduced into a text which was copied from dictation because the reader in his haste misread the abbreviations,<sup>66</sup> and when in discussing Greek abbreviations he points out that the last letter of the abbreviated word is written to make the case-ending clear to the reader.<sup>67</sup>

## 7. DITTOGRAPHY AND HAPLOGRAPHY

Both the repetition and the omission of similar letters in a word are indicated by Jerome in his comments on faulty readings, though examples of these specific errors are very few. The repetition of letters, however, is noted in his criticism of the copyist's error in writing *Iudaeae* instead of *Iudae*,<sup>68</sup> and the omission of letters is criticized in his comment on the reading *Bariona*, for which *Bar Ioanna* should have been written.<sup>69</sup>

## 8. METATHESIS OF LETTERS

There seems to be only one passage in the works of Jerome in which he states that a textual error has resulted from the transposition of letters in a word, and in this passage the error is charged not to a copyist but to a translator, whose misreading of a Hebrew word caused an error in the Greek text.<sup>70</sup> On another occasion, however, he seems

<sup>66</sup> *Ep.* 124. 1, 2.

<sup>67</sup> *Monogr. (Anec. Mared.* III. 3, p. 195). In this passage, Jerome seems to suggest also that the stroke placed over an abbreviation is intended to call attention to the abbreviation and so to help avoid confusion.

<sup>68</sup> *In Matth.* I (PL XXVI 26; V. 14). Cf. *Comm. in Ezech.* XII (PL XXV 379; V. 474), where the repetition of a word is noted.

<sup>69</sup> *In Matth.* III (PL XXVI 117; V. 124).

<sup>70</sup> *In Zach.* III (PL XXV 1514; V. 903). The words cited are *dacaru* and *racadu*. But Jerome adds that there was confusion of similar letters here.



to be illustrating this same kind of error when he discusses the variants ἀκριδων and δακρύων, although what he says is that the similarity of the words caused the error.<sup>71</sup>

#### 9. ASSIMILATION

That a line which a scribe has finished copying may cause an error in the copying of a following line is noted by Jerome, who cites examples showing that the error may consist of an addition of a part of the preceding line,<sup>72</sup> or of a substitution of it for what should have been written.<sup>73</sup> He seems also to indicate a similar cause of error within a line when he remarks that the change of one letter has resulted in the reading *reppulisti et respexisti* instead of the correct *reppulisti et despexisti*.<sup>74</sup>

#### 10. OMISSIONS

In a few of his comments on textual errors, Jerome points out omissions which he accounts for by the occurrence of the same word immediately before and after the omitted portion of the text, which causes the copyist to pass over everything from the first occurrence of the word to the second.<sup>75</sup> He can not always be sure, however, that the copyists were at fault, since he recognizes the possibility that the translators may have overlooked the omitted passage; but in either case, he assigns the same cause of error.<sup>76</sup>

<sup>71</sup> *In Os.* III (*PL* XXV 933; V. 146). This error might be classified as one of substitution of a similar word; yet such substitution at times involves the metathesis of letters, as here.

<sup>72</sup> *Ep.* 106. 27: "... sed hoc male et de superiori versiculo additum est. ..." Cf. *id.* 80.

<sup>73</sup> *Op. cit.* 43. 3: "In eodem: 'Donec adnuntiem brachium tuum.' Et dicitis in Graeco vos repperisse: 'mirabilia tua,' quod de superiori versiculo est. ..."

<sup>74</sup> *Op. cit.* 57. 3.

<sup>75</sup> *Ep.* 121. 2, 6.

<sup>76</sup> *In Is.* XI (*PL* XXIV 402; V. 482): "... manifestum est vel a LXX praetermissum vel paulatim scriptorum vitio abolitum: dum et prior et sequens versus finitur in flore."

## II. TRANSPOSITIONS

As is clear from several passages in his writings, Jerome was familiar with errors caused by disturbances in the order of words, phrases, and larger units of a text,<sup>77</sup> for which he occasionally blames, whether explicitly or implicitly, the negligence of the copyists.<sup>78</sup> Some of the confusions of arrangement he criticizes sharply, remarking that they make the thought obscure,<sup>79</sup> and that they disturb the sequence of the parts of a passage.<sup>80</sup> Yet he distinguishes carefully actual confusions in the text from what may appear to be a confusion but is rather a stylistic arrangement peculiar to the author or to the form of his work. Thus he makes a distinction between the sequence of facts in the books of the prophets and that in the historical books of the Bible.<sup>81</sup>

## 12. CONSCIOUS EMENDATION

Very frequently Jerome censures the efforts of copyists to emend the readings of a text, because such efforts usually result only in making errors. These errors differ in form, one of the most common being the substitution by the copyist of a familiar word for an unfamiliar one.<sup>82</sup> Or the copyist, because of a misunderstanding or because of his disapproval of a word, may substitute one which he judges to be more appropriate to the context.<sup>83</sup> Still other forms are illustrated in Jerome's references to a copyist's deletion of a word which he thought was erroneously repeated in the exemplar,<sup>84</sup> to the addition of what he

<sup>77</sup> *In Ezech.* XIII (PL XXV 413; V. 516); *Ep.* 18A. 15, 7; 106. 45, 4.

<sup>78</sup> *In Hier. Praefat.* 2; *Nom. Hebr. Praefat.* (PL XXIII 771; V. 1 sq.); *Ep.* 18A. 15, 7.

<sup>79</sup> *Praefat. in Lib. Sal.* (PL XXIX 404).

<sup>80</sup> *In Ezech.* II (PL XXV 63; V. 64).

<sup>81</sup> *In Hier.* IV 29. 3; *In Dan.* (PL XXV 527; V. 663).

<sup>82</sup> *Ep.* 106. 50, 2; *In Psalm.* 86 (*Anec. Mared.* III. 2, p. 102). Jerome gives also a detailed account of the substitution of the familiar name *Isaiah* for the unfamiliar *Asaph* in a passage in *Matthew*, and reconstructs the history of the error. See *Comm. in Matth.* II (PL XXVI 92; V. 94) and *Tract. in Psalm.* 77 (*Anec. Mared.* III. 2, pp. 59 sq.).

<sup>83</sup> *In Gal.* III (PL XXVI 402; V. 488); *In Is.* XV (PL XXIV 529; V. 643).

<sup>84</sup> *In Hier.* IV 43. 4; V 45. 2; VI 7. 6.

thought was omitted in the exemplar,<sup>85</sup> and to the changing of a word from the singular to the plural or from the plural to the singular.<sup>86</sup> Finally an interesting example is discussed by Jerome which may be included here. In one of his letters, he writes that someone incorporated in the text of a certain passage a marginal notation which he himself had written for the benefit of the reader. The discussion makes it reasonably clear, however, that it was not the whole note which found its way into the text but only a word which Jerome was defending against the reading of the text and which he would accept as a correction of the text. Yet he maintains that the copyist should not have taken it on himself to insert the reading of the note into the text, but should have followed the text exactly as it was.<sup>87</sup>

### 13. INTERPOLATIONS

Examples of Jerome's criticism of interpolations in the text of the Bible are comparatively numerous. For convenience of presentation, I have divided these examples into three groups, of which the first comprises discussions of passages drawn from one book of the Bible and inserted in another. In commenting on interpolations of this kind, Jerome usually indicates their source in support of his criticism.<sup>88</sup> In the second group may be included the many passages in which he points out additions made in the Greek version by the Septuagint translators without any support in the Hebrew text.<sup>89</sup> The third group consists of two examples in which his arguments for deleting an interpolation are different from those already mentioned and different from

<sup>85</sup> *Praefat. in Quat. Evang.* (PL XXIX 528): "Magnus siquidem hic in nostris codicibus error inolevit, dum quod in eadem re alius evangelista plus dixit, in alio quia minus putaverint, addiderunt."

<sup>86</sup> *Ep.* 106. 46, 2: "Miror quis in codice vestro emendando perverterit, ut pro 'sancto' 'sanctis' posuerit. . . ." *Id.* 47: "'Narrabimus . . . ' Pro quo male apud Graecos legitur, 'narrabo. . . .'"

<sup>87</sup> *Ep.* 106. 46, 3 sqq.

<sup>88</sup> *In Mal.* (PL XXV, 1544; V. 943); *Ep.* 106. 69, 1; *In Psalm.* 133 (*Anec. Mared.* III. 1, p. 91).

<sup>89</sup> A general statement is made in *Ep.* 57. 11, 1: "Longum est nunc evolere quanta Septuaginta de suo addiderint. . . ." For specific examples, see *Comm. in Is.* III (PL XXIV 117; V. 120); *id.* XV (PL XXIV 642; V. 659). Jerome says such passages should be marked with the *obelus*.

each other as well. In one he comments on the inconsistency of the suspected words with the sense of the passage as a whole;<sup>90</sup> in the other he simply remarks that a word was added through the fault of the copyists.<sup>91</sup>

#### 14. VARIOUS ERRORS

In addition to the kinds of errors which have been enumerated, there are many others mentioned by Jerome from time to time in his works without any specific indication of their nature. Hence they can not be classified according to any explanation offered by Jerome; but a few examples may be included here for their cumulative value as evidence of his thoroughness in his critical procedure. At times he remarks that a word or passage found in some copies of the Bible is either different from the reading of other copies or omitted altogether.<sup>92</sup> He notes also various faulty readings which have found their way into the text, such as the erroneous *unxit* for *benedixit*.<sup>93</sup> Still other matters which his criticism takes into account include the inflectional forms of nouns and verbs,<sup>94</sup> and the spelling of Hebrew words in the translated texts.<sup>95</sup>

#### II. HIGHER CRITICISM

The works of Jerome contain abundant evidence of the fact that his qualifications for the rôle of textual critic were not limited to the discussion of questions appropriate to lower criticism, but included as well the ability to deal with various problems which belong to the art of higher criticism. Indeed the frequency with which his remarks are directed toward these problems is an indication that their consideration held a place of importance in his critical procedure. In order,

<sup>90</sup> *In Matth.* I (PL XXVI 36; V. 26).

<sup>91</sup> *Op. cit.* I (PL XXVI 29; V. 17).

<sup>92</sup> *Adv. Pelag.* II 15 (PL XXIII 550; V. 758); *id.* II 17 (PL XXIII 553; V. 762).

Cf. *Aug. Pecc. Mer.* I 13.

<sup>93</sup> *Ep.* 65. 9, 1. Cf. his discussion of the readings *τεταγμένα* and *τεταμένα* (*In Ezech.* IX (PL XXV 296; V. 366)) and of the readings *σχοίνοις* and *σχίνοις* (*In Mich.* II (PL XXV, 1207; V. 502)).

<sup>94</sup> *Ep.* 106. 41, 4; 50, 3.

<sup>95</sup> *In Hier.* III 81. 9.



therefore, that this presentation of critical principles known to him may have some degree of completeness, I shall give an account of the problems of higher criticism to which his comments seem to point.

#### I. CHANGES IN BOOK-DIVISION

Familiar as Jerome was with the practice, established by the Alexandrian scholars, of dividing large works into books,<sup>96</sup> it seems only natural for him to observe that in the translations of the Old Testament the book-division did not always correspond to that of the Hebrew texts. On several occasions he remarks that the Psalms, which constituted one book in the Hebrew text, were regarded as divided into five books in the Greek translation.<sup>97</sup> Similarly he points out that *Chronicles*, though divided into two books in the Latin version, comprised but one book in the Hebrew text.<sup>98</sup> He does not go so far as to say that the original arrangement should be restored, but he does seem to think it important as a part of his criticism to inform his readers what that arrangement was and how it was altered in the translations.

#### 2. PROBLEMS ARISING FROM COMPOSITION

In the text of *Daniel*, which Jerome discusses at some length because of various difficulties involved in it, two passages are criticized on grounds which indicate that their relation to the composition of the book as a whole raised a question of their origin and therefore of their authenticity. One of these passages was written in what he terms the Chaldaic or Syriac language;<sup>99</sup> the other contained certain etymologies

<sup>96</sup> References to book-division occur in his writings, *passim*. See especially the prefaces to books IV, VII, IX, and X of his *Commentarii in Ezechielem* (PL XXV).

<sup>97</sup> E.g., *Praefat. in Lib. Psalm.* (PL XXVIII 1123). Cf. his remarks on the writings of the twelve prophets: *Praefat. in duodec. Proph.* (PL XXVIII 1015).

<sup>98</sup> *Praefat. in Lib. Paralip.* (PL XXIX 402). It is interesting to observe that in this passage Jerome compares the division of this book of the Bible with the division of Cicero's *Brutus* by individual readers: "... quod nonnulli etiam in Bruto, Ciceronis dialogo, faciunt, ut eum in tres partes secent, cum unus a suo auctore sit editus."

<sup>99</sup> *In Dan.* (PL XXV 499; V. 628): "... Hebraicis quidem litteris, sed lingua scribuntur Chaldaica, quam vocant hic Syriacam."

which gave evidence of a Greek source.<sup>100</sup> Neither of the passages does he condemn outright, but his comment on the second implies that unless the etymologies can be shown to be Hebrew as well as Greek, the passage should be rejected.<sup>101</sup>

Another type of problem arising from textual composition is taken into account in Jerome's discussion of the question whether *Psalms* 114 and 115, as numbered in some texts, are properly two or one. Here he is concerned with the problem of determining the arrangement intended by the author; and he offers the opinion, based on the authority of the Hebrew text, that the two should be written as one.<sup>102</sup>

### 3. REJECTION OF PARTS OF A WORK

Aside from the parts of the text of *Daniel* mentioned above, Jerome views critically two passages which apparently were current in the translations — namely, the hymn sung by the Hebrew youths in the fiery furnace, and the story of Bel and the Dragon. For these passages he found no support in the Hebrew text, and, consistent with his principle of following the authority of the Hebrew, he rejected them as spurious.<sup>103</sup> He also rejected certain books attributed to Ezra and classed them among the apocrypha, primarily on the ground that they are not accepted in the Hebrew texts; but he adds the explanation that they can not be accounted for in the reckoning of twenty-four books which comprise the Jewish law.<sup>104</sup>

<sup>100</sup> *Op. cit.* (PL XXV 582; V. 734).

<sup>101</sup> *Loc. cit.*: "Quod si quis ostenderit . . . in Hebraeo stare etymologiam, tunc poterimus etiam hanc scripturam recipere." His language suggests that perhaps he leaned toward acceptance of the passage; yet in his translation of *Daniel* this part (the story of Susanna) was marked with the *obelus*, as he states (*Op. cit. Praefat.* (PL XXV 493; V. 619 sq.)). Cf. his comments on the composition of *Maccabees*: *Praefat. in Lib. Sam. et Mal.* (PL XXVIII 555).

<sup>102</sup> *In Psalm.* 115 (*Anec. Mared.* III. 1, p. 83); *Tract. in Psalm.* 115 (*Anec. Mared.* III. 2, p. 213).

<sup>103</sup> *In Dan.* (PL XXV 509; V. 64c); *id. Praefat.* (PL XXV 493; V. 619). Cf. *Praefat. in Lib. Dan.* (PL XXVIII 1293), where Jerome quotes a criticism of the hymn offered by a Jewish teacher — a criticism which he leaves, however, to the judgment of the reader. The hymn, nevertheless, is marked with the *obelus* in his translation of *Daniel* (PL XXVIII, 1299 sqq.).

<sup>104</sup> *Praefat. in Lib. Esdr.* (PL XXVIII 14c3). See also *Praefat. in Lib. Sam. et Mal.* (PL XXVIII, 554).

## 4. ALTERATION OF TEXTS

Jerome makes numerous references to alterations made deliberately and often maliciously in the text not only of the writings of the early Christians but also of the Bible itself. Not a few of these references are to be found in his *Apologia adversus Libros Rufini*<sup>105</sup> and are probably, in view of the polemical nature of this work, to be somewhat discounted. Indeed he himself at times defends textual readings against charges of falsification, as he does in one of his remarks on the works of Origen<sup>106</sup> and in his discussion of certain Biblical passages.<sup>107</sup> Yet on at least two occasions, he states his own opinion that certain passages in the Old Testament had been deliberately altered by the Jews. His opinion is based in the one instance on the fact that a reading given in the Septuagint was not found either in any other translation or in the Hebrew text,<sup>108</sup> and in the other on the fact that Paul's quotation of the passage differed from the reading of the Hebrew text.<sup>109</sup> Deliberate mistranslation, which he suggests at least twice,<sup>110</sup> may be included here as being virtually the same as altering a text. It should be observed, too, that erasures might be regarded as presumptive proof of tampering with a text.<sup>111</sup>

## 5. PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

Jerome's comments on works which may be classed as pseudepigrapha suggest that he recognized two types, one comprising works which were attributed to some one other than their author, the other comprising works which were forgeries. The examples of the first type

<sup>105</sup> *Adv. Rufin.* (PL XXIII), *passim*.

<sup>106</sup> *Ep.* 84. 10, 2.

<sup>107</sup> *Adv. Helvid.* (PL XXIII 191; V. 213); *In Tit.* (PL XXVI 555; V. 685). Cf. Aug. *c. Faust.* XXXIII 6.

<sup>108</sup> *In Mich.* II (PL XXV 1198; V. 490). He allows, however, for the possibility that the translators of the Septuagint may have made an addition of their own: "... sive de veteribus libris erasum sit malitia Iudaeorum ... sive a Septuaginta additum. ..."

<sup>109</sup> *In Gal.* II (PL XXVI 357; V. 431). Here he admits also the possibility that Paul's quotation may not have been given verbatim.

<sup>110</sup> *In Hier.* III 17. 1 sq.; *In Is.* I (PL XXIV 55; V. 43).

<sup>111</sup> *Adv. Rufin.* II 20 (PL XXIII 444; V. 513 sq.). Cf. Aug. *Anim.* II 22.

include the following works: an epistle assigned to Jeremiah,<sup>112</sup> the book entitled *Sapientiae Salomonis*,<sup>113</sup> certain treatises attributed to Modestus,<sup>114</sup> and one ascribed to Pamphilus.<sup>115</sup> His discussion of the last-mentioned work is noteworthy because, in contrast with what he says of the others, he asserts that Rufinus deliberately and maliciously published under the name of Pamphilus a part of an heretical treatise written by Eusebius; and he gives a full account of his discovery of this fact as well as of the reason why, in his opinion, the name of Pamphilus was used — viz., to secure for a questionable work the approval that would attend the name of a martyr.<sup>116</sup> Of the second type, the examples are somewhat less cogent than those of the first type, since they are derived from Jerome's accusation laid against Rufinus of forging a letter over his name and from his defense against a similar accusation directed at him by Rufinus.<sup>117</sup> Yet the fact that forgeries were more or less common seems to be shown by his detailed explanation of the precaution taken by Paul to guarantee the genuineness of his letters.<sup>118</sup>

#### 6. VARIOUS POINTS PERTINENT TO QUESTIONS OF AUTHORSHIP

In the course of Jerome's numerous discussions directed at the authorship of various works, several points of evidence are introduced which give at least a reasonable indication of what he regarded as significant in considering problems of this sort. Some of these points

<sup>112</sup> *In Hier. Praefat.*, 2.

<sup>113</sup> *Praefat. in Lib. Sal.* (PL XXVIII 1242).

<sup>114</sup> *Vir. illust.* 32. Cf. Augustine's remarks on certain works circulated in Spain under his name: *De Gest. Pelag.* 19.

<sup>115</sup> *Adv. Rufin.* II 23 (PL XXIII 446; V. 516 sq.).

<sup>116</sup> *Adv. Rufin.* II 23 (PL XXIII 446; V. 516 sq.); *id.* III 12 (PL XXIII 465 sqq.; V. 541 sqq.); *Ep.* 84. 11. In the course of his account, he states that he discovered the fact that Pamphilus had never written anything except a few letters and that the book ascribed to him was identical with the first book of a treatise composed by Eusebius. Cf. *Comm. in Ezech.* VI (PL XXV 173; V. 206), where he accuses Rufinus of circulating another work which he had falsely inscribed with the name of the martyr Xistus.

<sup>117</sup> *Adv. Rufin.* III, 25 (PL XXIII 476; V. 554); III, 20 (PL XXIII, 471; V. 549).

<sup>118</sup> *In Gal.* III (PL XXVI 434; V. 529 sq.). Cf. Augustine's remarks on the forgery of letters: *De Gest. Pelag.* 1; 19.



he derives from the statements of other persons, whose opinions he sets forth but does not necessarily accept; others seem to represent his own criticism. His purpose, however, is by no means limited to proving an erroneous ascription of authorship; rather, he seems more often interested in supporting the authorship attested by the MSS.

An example of the uncertainty of authorship which might arise when different authors have the same name is pointed out by Jerome in his account of the writings of the apostle John. To this John some persons attributed two letters written, as he maintains, by another John, whom he designates as the Elder or the Presbyter.<sup>119</sup> In support of his opinion, he quotes the salutation of the letters, in which the epithet *Senior* appears,<sup>120</sup> and refers to a catalog compiled by Papias in which the distinction in the identity of the two Johns is carefully indicated.<sup>121</sup>

The authorship of a work might be questioned, too, if the work seemed inferior in subject or in manner of treatment when compared with accepted writings of the author concerned. On such grounds, as Jerome points out, suspicion was cast on the authenticity of the *Letter to Philemon*; for certain critics objected to accepting it as a genuine letter of Paul's, asserting that it was too mundane in tone and subject.<sup>122</sup> Jerome, however, argues that if this letter is to be rejected for such a reason, other letters accepted by these critics would have to be rejected, since in them also there is at times a similar worldliness of tone and subject.<sup>123</sup> Further, other critics thought the *Letter to Philemon* inferior, and therefore unauthentic, because of its brevity;<sup>124</sup> but Jerome sets this objection aside with the remark:

Si autem brevitatis habetur contemptui, contemnatur Abdias, Naum, Sophonias, et alii duodecim prophetarum, in quibus tam mira et tam grandia sunt quae feruntur, ut nescias utrum brevitatem sermonum in illis admirari debeas, an magnitudinem sensuum. Quod si intellexerent hi, qui Epistolam ad Philemonem repudiant, numquam brevitatem despicerent. . . .<sup>125</sup>

<sup>119</sup> *Vir. illust.* 9.

<sup>120</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>121</sup> *Op. cit.* 18.

<sup>122</sup> *In Philem. Praefat.* (PL XXVI 599 sqq.; V. 741 sqq.).

<sup>123</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>124</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>125</sup> *Loc. cit.*

The importance of evidence pointing to the probable date of composition of a work is also recognized by Jerome, who takes such evidence into account in some of his discussions of authorship. Thus he supports his arguments for the genuineness of the *Letter to Philemon* by evidence that the letter was written at the same time as certain others of Paul's letters generally accepted as authentic.<sup>126</sup> It is interesting, however, to observe that in discussing the authorship of a psalm which was ascribed to Moses but which some critics said was written by David because Samuel, who lived long after Moses, is named in it, Jerome answers the question of chronology by saying that the reference to Samuel is prophetic.<sup>127</sup>

An additional point of evidence mentioned by Jerome is that which is afforded by contradictory statements or conflicting points of view expressed in works attributed to the same author. He states, for example, the opinion of Rufinus that someone had falsified certain parts of one of Origen's works, based on the fact that the sentiment expressed was not compatible with that of Origen elsewhere on the same subject.<sup>128</sup> So, too, he relates that someone inscribed a work by Gregory with the name of another writer because in this work a certain philosopher was praised who was criticized in another written by Gregory.<sup>129</sup> Jerome, however, who supports the attribution of both works to Gregory, remarks that anyone may criticize and praise the same person on different occasions.<sup>130</sup> His position indicates that at least in this case he regarded the evidence of conflicting attitudes as of little value.

Frequently he takes the evidence of style into account when discussing problems connected with authorship. His own study of rhetoric apparently had developed in him a sensitiveness to stylistic differences in the writings of various authors and perhaps a keen interest in these differences, for he characterizes the style of some of the Old Testament prophets quite apart from any question of the authen-

<sup>126</sup> *Op. cit.* (PL XXVI 605 sq.; V. 747 sq.). Cf. *Comm. in Dan. Praefat.* (PL XXV 491; V. 617 sq.), where Porphyrio's criticism of the authenticity of *Daniel* is stated. Against this criticism, a point of evidence for the date of composition is mentioned later by Jerome: see *id.* PL XXV 512; V. 644.

<sup>127</sup> *Ep.* 140. 4, 3 sqq.

<sup>128</sup> *Adv. Rufin.* II 11 (PL XXIII 434; V. 501).

<sup>129</sup> *Vir. illust.* 117.

<sup>130</sup> *Loc. cit.*

ticity of the works attributed to them.<sup>131</sup> His use of stylistic tests, therefore, in considering a question of authorship is not surprising; and it makes possible some estimate of the extent to which he would rely on such tests. When he rejects the *Wisdom of Solomon*<sup>132</sup> and one of the books of *Maccabees*<sup>133</sup> from works of Hebrew origin on the ground that their style indicates a Greek source, he reveals his feeling that the stylistic traits of different languages can be distinguished. Moreover, on occasion he seems quite positive of his recognition of the style of a particular writer.<sup>134</sup> Yet more frequently he feels a degree of uncertainty which prevents him from doing more than offering a conjecture on the authorship of a letter,<sup>135</sup> or a hint that the authorship of certain works may have been wrongly ascribed, the latter suggestion being implicit in his statement that the style of these works is different from that of other works of the same authors.<sup>136</sup> Yet it is clear that he recognized the possibility of valid reasons why the style of different works of an author might vary, for when he discusses two letters attributed to Peter he disagrees with those critics who denied Peter's authorship of one of them on grounds of differences of style.<sup>137</sup> Furthermore his references to the opinions of various persons on the authorship of the *Letter to the Hebrews* — opinions based on the test of style — seem to indicate that he was aware of the subjective element in judgments of this sort.<sup>138</sup> Hence it may be said that Jerome in considering the evi-

<sup>131</sup> E.g., *Praefat. in Lib. Is.* (PL XXVIII 771); *Praefat. in Lib. Ezech.* (PL XXVIII 938).

<sup>132</sup> *Praefat. in Lib. Sal.* (PL XXVIII 1242): "Fertur . . . et alius ψευδεπίγραφος qui Sapiencia Salomonis inscribitur . . . Secundus apud Hebraeos nusquam est, quia et ipse stilus Graecam eloquentiam redolet. . . ."

<sup>133</sup> *Praefat. in Lib. Sam. et Mal.* (PL XXVIII 556): "Machabaeorum primum librum Hebraicum repperi. Secundus Graecus est, quod ex ipsa quoque φράσει probari potest." Both books, however, are included in the list of non-canonical writings given here.

<sup>134</sup> *Adv. Rufin.* I 4 (PL XXIII 400; V. 460 sq.): "Certe haec illius verba sunt, negare non potest. Ipsa stili elegantia et sermo compositus, quodque his maius est, simplicitas Christiana, auctoris sui characterem probant." Cf. II 19 (PL XXIII 444; V. 513).

<sup>135</sup> *Ep.* 102. I, 2.

<sup>136</sup> *Vir. illust.* 25; 58.

<sup>137</sup> *Op. cit.* I; *Ep.* 120. II, 5. Cf. his remarks (*Vir. illust.* 5) on the *Letter to the Hebrews*, apparently supporting the attribution of the letter to Paul.

<sup>138</sup> *Vir. illust.* 5.

dence of style was disposed to give it reasonable weight but understood that it must be used with caution and restraint.

#### 7. THE BIBLICAL CANON

Finally a word on Jerome's references to the canon of the Bible may be appropriate, for although in general they throw little light on his knowledge of the principles of criticism, being confined chiefly to an enumeration of the writings which constituted the canon and of a number which were excluded from it,<sup>139</sup> they occasionally reveal an opinion of his own. His comments, for example, on the works of Luke include an expression of opinion on the *Journeys of Paul and Thecla*, which he pronounces apocryphal. His judgment is based on the silence of Luke, who, because of his intimate association with Paul, must have known of these experiences if they were factual; yet in his narrative, written after Paul's arrival in Rome, there is no mention of them.<sup>140</sup> He also points out the fact that the *Letter to the Hebrews* was rejected from the canon by the Roman Christians but accepted by the Greek Christians, and suggests that the difference in attitude was the result of the difference in their opinion of the authorship of the letter.<sup>141</sup> Conversely, the Greeks rejected *Revelation*, whereas the Romans apparently accepted it;<sup>142</sup> but Jerome offers no explanation, although he says that he himself, on the authority of older writers, would accept both books.<sup>143</sup> On the whole, however, he regards time spent on non-canonical writings as wasted and prefers to devote his attention to the generally accepted canon.<sup>144</sup>

<sup>139</sup> *Praefat. in Lib. Sam. et Mal.* (PL XXVIII 552 sqq.). Besides the non-canonical writings mentioned here, others are named elsewhere in Jerome's works, *passim*.

<sup>140</sup> *Vir. illust.* 7. He adds (*loc. cit.*) the opinion of Tertullian, who "... refert presbyterum quendam in Asia, σπουδαστήν apostoli Pauli, convictum apud Iohannem, quod auctor esset libri, et confessum se hoc Pauli amore fecisse, loco excidisse."

<sup>141</sup> *Ep.* 129. 3, 7 sq. Cf. *Vir. illust.* 59.

<sup>142</sup> *Ep.* 129. 3, 7 sq.

<sup>143</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>144</sup> *Praefat. in Lib. Sal.* (PL XXIX 404): "... tantummodo canonicas scripturas vobis emendare desiderans, et studium meum certis magis quam dubiis commendare." On the special request of his friends, however, he translated a few non-canonical writings. See, e.g., *Praefat. in Tob.* (PL XXIX 23 sq.); *Praefat. in Lib. Iudith* (PL XXIX 37 sqq.). But *Judith*, as Jerome points out, was non-canonical only among the Jews, for the Christian Church had accepted it.





SUMMARIES OF DISSERTATIONS FOR THE DEGREE  
OF PH.D.

JAMES RICHARD REID — *The Expression of Future Time: from Indo-European to Romance*<sup>1</sup>

IN the development from Latin to the Romance languages there was a vast shift from the highly synthetic structure of Latin, to the highly analytical structure of the modern tongues. The exact nature of this process, and its causes and conditions, constitute a major problem of general linguistics.

During the same period, the methods of expressing futurity in the verb-system underwent changes which are similar to those observed in the general structure of the Romance languages, but whose speed of development has been much greater. For here we find a definitely cyclical process consisting of a shift from synthesis (in Classical Latin — *amabo* —) to analysis (in late Vulgar Latin — *amare habeo*, etc. —), followed by a shift back to synthesis (in modern Romance — *j'aimerai*, *amaré*, etc. —), and signs of a further reversion to analytical or periphrastic expression — *je vais*, *dois chanter*, etc. —; while the prehistoric period gives evidence of one or perhaps even two earlier phases of the cycle.

The importance in general linguistic history of the process of agglutination — whereby conceptual words become articulatory words and finally bound morphemes — is a difficult and much debated problem. In the shifts from analytical to synthetic expression of futurity we have to deal with undisputed instances of agglutination. A study of this development, viewed as a single, continuous process throughout its long history, should throw light on the general problem of change in grammatical types.

The present dissertation aims to provide a unified history of the expression of futurity from Indo-European to Romance. While taking account of the various explanations offered to explain specific parts of the long development — explanations generally based on semantic,

<sup>1</sup> Degree in Comparative Philology.

psychological, or phonological factors —, it examines primarily the morphological and syntactic conditions attending that development.

The verbal systems existing at each period are examined in detail, and the evidence for many disputed points is weighed, with the double aim of accounting for the process as a whole and of distinguishing rigidly between fact and hypothesis. Some of the principal conclusions are as follows.

There is reason to suppose that in every period, from the Indo-European to the modern, there was an abundance of verb forms or verbal periphrases used for anticipation of the end of action — perhaps even for the specific expression of futurity. But such forms of expression did not always constitute a true future tense, for the very category of tense itself was lacking at some periods, as in the oldest IE, where the verb system was organized primarily around the category of aspect; and furthermore even where the category of tense is present it does not always embrace the expression of futurity, as is generally the case in Germanic.

A periphrastic origin has been claimed for numerous Latin and Romance verb forms expressing futurity. For some this is a practical certainty, for some simply a possibility, and for others the theory of periphrastic origin has to be discarded.

(1) The Latin *b*-future can be satisfactorily explained only as a fused periphrasis, since separate agglutination of a commonly inherited phrase type is the only explanation for both the similarities and the differences between the Latin forms and certain Keltic future forms. The comparative Italic evidence tends to support this view. It is impossible, however, to identify with assurance either of the two elements in the periphrasis. The suffix, from *\*bh<sub>2</sub>yo*, may be either an aorist short-vowel subjunctive or an indicative. The base can be plausibly explained either as a verbal root infinitive, or as a present participle, which in either case was analogically assimilated to the present stem. (2) The future active participle in *-turum* may just possibly be of periphrastic origin, but the evidence for this hypothesis is extremely weak. (3) The gerund may possibly be derived from an accusative in *-um*, but here also the evidence is exceedingly weak. (4) The late Latin *-tuiri* future passive infinitive, if not just a scribal error, is certainly agglutinative in origin, but its use was so limited,

and its nature so uncertain, that little is to be learned from a study of its genesis. (5) The Latin and the Osco-Umbrian future perfects are almost certainly not agglutinated as phrases, as some have believed, nor can they be proved to be aorists from the Italic point of view; they rather represent Italic *s*-futures incorporated into the *perfectum*. The so-called 'contracted' forms like *amaro* are, then, the oldest form of the Latin future perfect, and are identical in formation with such forms as *faxo*. (6) The general Romance future tense is beyond any doubt an agglutinated phrase consisting of infinitive plus *habeo*, etc., with semantic influence also of *-ndum habeo*. (7) Certain periphrastic constructions in Rumanian (notably the conditional: *cîntare-aş* or *aş cînta*) are almost, though not completely, fused — at least when the auxiliary is placed after the infinitive.

The increased use of periphrastic expressions of futurity in late VL is closely related to broader changes in the grammatical structure of the language; in particular it reflects a general development in the use of the infinitive, which lost more and more of the attributes of a verb, including tense and voice and the ability to take a subject, but retained the ability to govern complements, and hence became (except for the past participle) the almost universal non-finite form for verbal periphrases. The result was a single, syntactically unified type of phrase, in which the identity of the finite verb is all-important.

The late VL phrase consisting of infinitive + *habeo* was capable of a variety of meanings and of two syntactic interpretations. First there arose easily out of older usage the meaning of possibility or ability. Here, when a transitive infinitive was used if an object was expressed, it was normally the object not of the infinitive but of *habeo*. Next, under the influence of *habeo* + gerund or gerundive in *-ndum*, the idiom acquired the meaning of obligation or necessity. Here an object was the object of the infinitive, which was itself the object of *habeo*. It is from the latter syntactic type that the periphrasis of futurity developed, but it is an error to attempt a rigid separation. The periphrastic *habeo*-future developed from what was essentially a single idiom, ambiguous in both meaning and syntactic structure.

The choice of *habere*, among all its competitors, for fusion with the infinitive to produce the synthetic future, is certainly related to the fact that *habere* stands apart from the rest by its greater frequency and



less precise meaning. Semantic weakness made it peculiarly appropriate to act as auxiliary. This explanation is supported by statistics showing a steady increase in the relative frequency of *habere-avoir* compared with other possible auxiliaries of futurity from Plautine Latin to Modern French.

In conclusion, certain suggestions are made for future study of the dynamics of the process of agglutination and of change in grammatical method, in the light of the historical background provided in this dissertation.

LEONARD ERNEST WOODBURY — *Quomodo risu ridiculoque Graeci  
usi sint*<sup>1</sup>

THIS dissertation studies the notions of laughter and the ridiculous held by the Greeks from Homer to Plato, and a short chapter has been added on the views of Aristotle and Theophrastus, especially in their relation to Plato.

First to be considered is the Homeric laughter of the gods, who not infrequently laugh derisively at one another, although occasionally their laughter seems tempered by a kind of affection. Their inextinguishable merriment has aroused the interest of philosophers, the indignation of moralists, and, not least, the unprofitable speculation of classical scholars. It has been held by many that the scenes in the Homeric Olympus are unworthy of the sincere religion of the heroes, and upon supposed discrepancies thus detected many elaborate theories of the construction of the poems have been built. These opinions, it is maintained, are quite mistaken: the laughter of the gods is a characteristic uniquely divine. The gods of Homer are forever separated from mankind by their immortal strength, which nothing can impair; they alone can abandon themselves without reserve to unquenchable laughter, which in a man would be only a sign of madness. Indeed, the laughter of the gods and burlesques of their divinity are not unknown in other literatures, often without any taint of impiety or scepticism.

Men, on the other hand, must win for themselves by their acts a

<sup>1</sup> Degree in Classical Philology.

fair name before they die. Of the heroes of the *Iliad* only the despised Paris is twice said to laugh. In the *Odyssey* the frequent laughter of the suitors, in revelry or derision, is a mark of their ὕβρις, which is followed by ἄρνη sent upon them from heaven to arouse uncontrollable convulsions of laughter. From other examples also it is apparent that laughter was sometimes regarded as a kind of alienation of the reason. There are, of course, examples of laughter left uncensured, but laughter is clearly regarded as a thing to be enjoyed sparingly and with caution.

The heroes also are represented as exceedingly fearful of the reproaches of friends or the derision of enemies. It is significant that the gods laugh at one another, but never subject the heroes to their derision. Finally, though laughter is regarded most frequently as akin to derision, its tenderness is peculiarly exemplified in the laughter of Hector and the smiles and tears of Andromache.

The poets are next examined: Hesiod, to whom a smile of friendship is worth less than a bond, and who fears the derision of his fellows; Callinus, Tyrtaeus, and Solon, who honour the regard of their citizens and condemn the mockery of enemies; Archilochus who seems to desire to hold up to ridicule whoever has injured him or done wrong, and yet recognises certain limits within which ridicule must be kept; whose ridicule of his own good name offended the instincts of aristocrats like Critias; Semonides who knows the charm of a woman's smile and fears the derision she may bring upon a man; Theognis who knew that to laugh at a banquet with friends was permitted but who left the laughter of deceit to plebeians; who feared the ridicule of the many as the Homeric hero that of the enemy; Pindar who strove to defend the ideals of Greek nobility against the detraction and ridicule of envy but regarded derision as the lot of the vanquished and praise that of the victor; Aeschylus who sees in the tragic downfall of man the ridicule of his hopes; Sophocles whose wilful heroes are peculiarly sensitive to the derision of enemies but who can plead that the dead be spared ridicule — a tradition found elsewhere; Euripides whose passionate heroes and heroines are driven to the most heinous crimes to silence the laughter of their foes but who also uses laughter to introduce novel ideas.

Next, injunctions against ridicule of the unfortunate and of friends are found in the traditional wisdom of Greece and in Democritus.

Pythagoras first is said to have warned against excessive laughter. Derision of the views of others is found in Xenophanes, Heraclitus, and the historians. The ridicule of neighbors and enemies, which the common man feared, could be disregarded by Heraclitus and Democritus. Democritus, the laughing philosopher, and his counterpart, Heraclitus, have not been passed over, or the gravity attributed to sundry philosophers, or the moderation enjoined by Critias, or the value of play according to Anacharsis, or the use of ridicule in debate as recommended by Gorgias. Xenophon recognised perfectly the mixture of grave and gay in his master Socrates, and established canons of jesting and laughter. Lastly, the free ridicule of Aristophanes is associated with the festivals of Dionysus and cannot be criticised as it would be, were it practised on another occasion. Laughter is a joyful thing and he writes his comedies to please; yet, like other comedians, he recognises the bounds which must be set to laughter. He despises his vulgar rivals, he professes to teach serious things in jest, and he defends the traditional moral ideas of Greek life when he assails the howling Cleon, the abject pleader, the clownish jester, the new education with its rejection of all convention, even to the decorum which governs laughter.

In Plato the philosopher is often said to appear ridiculous in the eyes of the many because he is unaccustomed to their ways. And yet, rightly considered, he alone knows what it befits a free man to know and he may properly ridicule his deriders, albeit gently. Accordingly, Socrates, the model of the philosopher for Plato, is likened by Alcibiades in the *Symposium* to the satyric images which in appearance are ridiculous, but within them contain all that is conducive to the virtue of man. This is true not only of the contrast between Socrates' grotesque physical appearance and his noble mind, but also of his riddling character, compounded of irony and jest. Socrates is quite conscious of this, and frequently apologises for his ridiculous manner of speech or his absurd notions. But he will accept no conventional standard of ridicule; it must be referred to the ἑλεγχος. Therefore all errors detected by the argument are declared ridiculous. Indeed, Socrates himself, with characteristic irony, frequently admits that he has been proved equally ridiculous. The basis of the ridicule of the many is

examined and it is explained that the philosophic method ignores it; the ridicule of the sophists is turned upon themselves.

Plato forbids that any one indulge in laughter excessively; similarly he assails comedy because it weakens men's natural inhibitions. He is fully aware of the importance of public opinion and the unwritten law in controlling conduct, and therefore is careful to prevent excess or change even in the slightest matters, such as manners, games, and laughter. Indeed, at certain times, he entirely confounds the distinction between jest and earnest, since all things human are mere jests before God.

Aristotle, by his doctrine of the mean, distinguished the liberal jest from two illiberal extremes, buffoonery and churlishness. He makes explicit the idea of the decorum of the free man which must be observed even in jesting and laughter. His definition of comedy is considered, especially in its relation to previous thought. Unlike Plato, he regards play as an element in life not always to be governed by the same rules as ordinary conduct. Finally, the views of Theophrastus are briefly treated.

Added to the dissertation are four appendices: one on the part of laughter in certain Greek festivals; another on the interpretation of the epilogue of Pindar's *Second Pythian*; a third on passages dealing with laughter in a comic spirit in tragic poets before Euripides; and a fourth, the control of laughter.





## INDEX

- Alphabet: Greek, 30, 32f.; Latin, 30;  
*ogam*, 30.  
 Aquitanian, 40.  
 Belgae, 37, 40.  
 Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum* I 1.1-2, 9,  
 11ff.  
 Celtac, 37.  
 Collation: known to St. Jerome, 9off.  
 Divine names: Keltic, 44f.  
*e·kupeθari·s·*, 27, 8off.  
 Galli: defined, 20.  
 Gallia: defined, 20.  
 Gaul: dialects of, 3f., 9-13, 36, 48-52;  
 political organization of, 46f.  
 Germans in the Rhineland, 36.  
 Higher criticism in St. Jerome, 101ff.  
 Hulley, Karl Kelchner: Principles of  
 textual criticism known to St.  
 Jerome, 87ff.  
 Iberians (Aquitani), 36.  
 Illyrian, 38-40.  
 Keltic: defined, 15; influence on  
 Latin, 69, 73f.  
 Keltic dialect of north Italy, 27, 82ff.  
 Keltic dialects in Gaul, 68ff.  
 Keltic divine names, 44f.  
 Keltic words in modern French, 18.  
 KEATIKA, 1ff.  
 Kelts: expansion of, 42-44; home of,  
 37.  
 Latin in Gaul, 72ff.  
 Latinization in Gaul, 24, 29.  
 Ligurian, 27, 41, 77ff.  
 Ligurians, 36f.  
 Lower criticism in St. Jerome, 89ff.  
 Polybius II 35.4, 28, 82ff.  
 "Proto-Kelts," 37.  
 Reid, James Richard, 111ff.  
 St. Jerome and textual criticism,  
 87ff.  
 Substratum-theory, 50.  
 Textual errors observed by St.  
 Jerome, 93ff.  
 Whatmough, Joshua: KEATIKA,  
 1ff.  
 Woodbury, Leonard Ernest, 114ff.







PHILLIPS ACADEMY



3 1867 00072 4554

ward studies 480  
classical H26  
philology. v.55

